



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JANUARY 9, 2015

No. 4

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

Reverend Patrick Riffle, St. Peter's Catholic Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

God, our father, You guide everything in wisdom and love. "You are good and forgiving, full of love to all who call upon You."

We now praise You for that love and rejoice in Your abundant blessing. You call us today to grow in the knowledge of that love and invite us to receive Your blessings.

Accept the prayers we offer for our beloved Nation; protect it and keep it ever in Your sight. Fill this House of Representatives with Your holy wisdom, and may that wisdom lead to right action.

Strengthen these Representatives and their staffs as they labor for the common good and for what is just in Your eyes. May true harmony, lasting freedom, and justice be secured for all so that there may be lasting peace.

We ask this in Your most Holy Name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MARINO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 5 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

FAREWELL, VERONICA KALTRIDER

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to express my appreciation for Major Veronica Kaltrider. Veronica has been on loan to the office of the Second District of South Carolina from the United States Marine Corps for the past year serving as a military fellow.

Major Kaltrider enlisted in the United States Marine Corps in 1997 and received training the following year at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot at Parris Island, South Carolina. As the former Representative of this base, I know firsthand of the proficiency that Veronica has because of her training by the highest Marine Corps standards. Veronica's ability to connect with veterans has been a tremendous asset to our office.

Beginning this month, Veronica Kaltrider will serve as the manpower and personnel officer of the Marine Corps Office of Legislative Affairs. I wish her and her husband, Eric, a military police officer in the Marine Corps, all the best in the future. Godspeed.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and the President, by his actions, must never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. Our sympathy for the citizens of France fighting terrorism.

RECOGNIZING JONATHAN STIVERS

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to celebrate the unanimous Senate confirmation of a public servant of integrity, energy, expertise, and ability; a person of deep dedication to our country, to ending poverty, fighting disease, and advancing democracy; someone I have had the privilege to have on my staff for the past 15 years, the new assistant administrator for Asia at USAID: Jonathan Stivers.

Over the years, Jon worked closely with USAID and congressional committees to promote our national interests, fight poverty and disease around the world, and address ongoing challenges in global development across Asia.

He played a central role in advancing foreign policy priorities of our country, especially in the fields of human rights, appropriations, HIV/AIDS, international trade, and in countries across the Asia-Pacific region. Many of our Republican colleagues know that Jon worked very much across the aisle on all of these issues.

Jonathan's professionalism and attention to detail were unparalleled, and I can say with confidence on the most challenging and critical issues of our day, Jon Stivers consistently exhibits the leadership needed to improve the global community.

Though we will miss his expertise and his experience, I am proud that he is serving these critical issues in his new position, and I wish him; his wife, Ramsey, who is here with us; his baby daughters, Josephine and Parker, all the best in their new adventures.

Thank you, Jonathan Stivers. Congratulations and good luck.

LAW ENFORCEMENT APPRECIATION DAY

(Mr. GOODLATTE asked and was given permission to address the House

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, on Law Enforcement Appreciation Day, I want to extend my support and gratitude to the law enforcement officers across the country who serve our communities and the American people daily.

Our Nation was founded on the rule of law, and every day law enforcement officers carry out this legacy. They protect our neighborhoods from criminals, fight crime, ensure justice, and keep the peace.

Sadly, many law enforcement officers have died in the line of duty. Last year 118 law enforcement officers died, including three from the Commonwealth of Virginia. Last year's murder of two NYPD officers is a sober reminder that our Nation's law enforcement officers face danger every day as they carry out their duty to protect the American people.

In the Gospel of John, we are told that there is no greater love than to lay down one's life for one's friends, and this is true of our Nation's law enforcement officers. Every day they risk their lives so that you and I may be safe from harm.

These brave men and women are heroes and deserve to be recognized and honored for their service to our country.

TAR SANDS TAX LOOPHOLE ELIMINATION ACT

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, while I do not support the development of tar sands—an environmentally destructive and carbon-intensive process—we should not continue a loophole that lets oil companies off the hook for covering destruction from oil spills.

In 1990, we authorized the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund for the immediate costs of cleaning up oil spills, and it is funded by an excise tax on crude oil and petroleum products, but the oil derived from tar sands that would be transported through the Keystone XL pipeline is not subject to this tax.

Since that oil is a thick, sticky form of crude, more difficult and costly to clean up than other types of oil, the exemption makes no sense, especially if it is as safe as some allege. That is why yesterday I reintroduced the Tar Sands Tax Loophole Elimination Act, which would ensure that oil pays into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund that travels through this pipeline if it is ever constructed.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

READING THE CONSTITUTION

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, in just a few minutes my colleagues and I will be

following a tradition that we began when Republicans regained the majority in 2011 of reading the Constitution during the first week that we are back into session. I think this is a very important tradition that we have established here in the House of Representatives.

Our Speaker reminded us the other day that this is the first time in the history of the country that this has been done. This is our third Congress in a row to do this.

All of us, or almost all of us, carry a copy of the pocket version of the Constitution with us to remind us why we are here and what undergirds everything that we do in this House and in this Congress.

In the front of the copy I have, it says, "The Declaration of Independence was the promise; the Constitution was the fulfillment," and there is a quote from Alexander Hamilton: "The sacred rights of mankind are not to be rummaged for, among old parchments, or musty records. They are written, as with a sunbeam in the whole volume of human nature, by the hand of divinity itself; and can never be erased or obscured by the mortal power."

CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAW

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on this body to take up legislation to repeal the last-minute changes to campaign finance law that were tacked into a 1,600-page bill to fund the government this December.

As a result of this legislation, the wealthiest donors can now each contribute more than \$750,000 per year to a political party, more than seven times the previous cap. Worst of all, these changes were buried in a bill with no hearing and no public debate. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this body never even got a chance to vote on this provision since the bill was not considered under an open amendment process.

In all the conversations that I have had with residents throughout Washington State, I can tell you I have never heard anyone, Democrat or Republican, argue that the wealthy can't spend enough on politics or that those with the deepest pockets don't have enough influence in our Nation's Capital.

That is why I have introduced the Close the Floodgates Act, to protect the interests of "We the People" and make sure that the wealthiest donors don't get another chance to flood our elections with even more money and to undermine our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, let's take up this legislation, strip out those loopholes, and get to work restoring the faith and trust of American voters.

DR. KENNETH COOPER

(Mr. SESSIONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a remarkable individual from Dallas, Texas, to recognize him for his introduction into the National Football Foundation's Leadership Hall of Fame last night, January 8, 2015.

I would like to thank Chairman Archie Manning, football player Troy Aikman, Mayor Tom and Laura Leppert, and football player Roger Staubach for recognizing Dr. Kenneth Cooper for his dedication to health and fitness and his continuing leadership to health care for all.

Throughout Dr. Cooper's career in the United States Air Force and in a medical career in Dallas, Texas, he has continued to revitalize health care and fitness. He is also the father of preventative medicine and known as the father of aerobics, trying to make sure that the American people and the world understand how important fitness is to our life and our health.

I want to express my hearty congratulations to Dr. Cooper on receiving this outstanding award on behalf of the National Football Foundation, and I hope the American people and, today, the United States Congress will do so as well.

FUNDING COLLEGE EDUCATION FOR ALL

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today the President will be speaking in Knoxville, Tennessee, on extending college educations to Americans.

I share with the President the goal of giving more Americans the opportunity to go to college, but I would submit to him he should not be holding up the Tennessee Promise plan in Tennessee as an example. He should be holding up the Tennessee HOPE Lottery Scholarship program, which I worked 20 years to achieve in Tennessee and has provided over \$3 billion to education, \$250 million a year.

Scholarship programs such as the President is talking about should have standards for students in high school to achieve to get a scholarship. They should have strong standards in college to maintain them. They should be in addition to Pell grants and in addition to other scholarships to pay for books and tuition.

The Promise plan takes from middle class and lower income students and gives to higher income students, doesn't have standards in high school to get the scholarship, and doesn't have high standards to keep it. It is a last dollar scholarship.

The President's plan should be more like the Tennessee HOPE Lottery Scholarship: assure students have an incentive in high school to get it and incentives to keep it with high grade standards, and it shouldn't go to for-profit schools, for that is an invitation to abuse.

I thank the President for his commitment, but I think he has the wrong program as his model.

FUNDING AMNESTY FOR ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS

(Mrs. ROBY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, President Obama's attempt to bypass Congress and grant amnesty to millions of illegal immigrants is wrong and dangerous. It undermines the rule of law and threatens American jobs.

That is why right now several of my colleagues and I, including fellow appropriators, are putting the finishing touches on a plan that will wield the power of the purse to block executive amnesty.

I believe we have a solid strategy. We wanted to put forward the simplest, most straightforward bill language that could defund the President's immigration actions. Thankfully my own Alabama Senator, JEFF SESSIONS, had already generated some great model language doing just that, so we crafted that into the House bill.

We are still working on it, but I am confident that strong defund language will be presented to this House for inclusion in the Homeland appropriations title.

I believe the will of Congress must be to fund Homeland Security and its important functions, but to specifically block implementation of President Obama's unconstitutional immigration orders.

□ 0915

READING OF THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Pursuant to section 5 of House Resolution 5, the Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for the reading of the Constitution.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, for the third time in the history of the House of Representatives, we will read aloud on the floor of the House the full text of the United States Constitution.

It is our hope that this reading will help demonstrate to the American people that the House of Representatives is dedicated to the Constitution and the system it establishes for limited government and the protection of individual liberty. We also hope that it will inspire many more Americans to read the Constitution themselves.

The text we will read today reflects the changes to the document made by the 27 amendments to it. Those portions superseded by amendment will not be read.

In order to ensure fairness to all those interested in participating, we have asked Members to line up to be recognized on a first-come, first-served basis. I will recognize Members based

on this guidance. Each Member will approach the podium and read the passage laid out for him or her.

In order to ensure relative parity and fairness, I may recognize Members out of order in order to ensure bipartisanship and balance. Additionally, because of his long-term leadership on civil rights issues, I will recognize the gentleman from Georgia, Representative JOHN LEWIS, to read the Thirteenth Amendment.

I want to thank the Members of both parties for their participation in this historic event. I will begin by recognizing the gentleman from Ohio, Speaker BOEHNER, to read the preamble to the Constitution:

Mr. BOEHNER. "We the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Mr. GOODLATTE. Article I, section 1:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

I now yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY. Section 2:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. "No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the age of twenty-five years, and been seven years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

"The actual enumeration shall be made within three years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of ten years, in such manner as they shall by law direct."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. "The number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty-thousand, but each State shall have at least one Representative; and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to chuse three, Massachusetts eight, Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations one, Connecticut five, New-York six, New Jersey four, Pennsylvania eight, Delaware one, Maryland six, Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina five, and Georgia three."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. "When vacancies happen in the representation from any State, the executive authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies.

"The House of Representatives shall chuse their Speaker and other officers; and shall have the sole power of impeachment."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Section 3:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote.

"Immediately after they shall be assembled in consequence of the first election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three classes."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. "The seats of the Senators of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year, of the second class at the expiration of the fourth year, and of the third class at the expiration of the sixth year, so that one-third may be chosen every second year."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. "No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the age of thirty years, and been nine years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. "The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no vote, unless they be equally divided.

"The Senate shall chuse their other officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the office of President of the United States."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. "The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose, they shall be on oath or affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside; and no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two thirds of the Members present."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. "Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust or profit under the United States; but the party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and

subject to indictment, trial, judgment and punishment, according to law.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

Mr. MARINO. Section 4:

“The times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. Section 5:

“Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own Members, and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business; but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the attendance of absent Members, in such manner, and under such penalties as each House may provide.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. “Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly behaviour, and, with the concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. “Each House shall keep a Journal of its proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such parts as may in their judgment require secrecy; and the yeas and nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the desire of one fifth of those present, be entered on the Journal.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. “Neither House, during the session of Congress, shall, without the consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other place than that in which the two Houses shall be sitting.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Section 6:

“The Senators and Representatives shall receive a compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States. They shall in all cases, except treason, felony and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any speech or debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other place.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. “No Senator or Representative shall, during the time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of

the United States, which shall have been created, or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased during such time; and no person holding any office under the United States, shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Section 7:

“All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE).

Mr. GUTHRIE. “Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a law, be presented to the President of the United States: if he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ).

Mr. WALZ. “If after such reconsideration two thirds of that House shall agree to pass the bill, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two thirds of that House, it shall become a law.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. “But in all such cases the votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against the bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. “If any bill shall not be returned by the President within ten days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law, in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their adjournment prevent its return, in which case it shall not be a law.”

□ 0930

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

Mr. BENISHEK. “Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the same shall take effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the rules and limitations prescribed in the case of a bill.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Section 8:

“The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. “. . . to borrow money on the credit of the United States;

“To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

“To establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. “. . . to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures;

“To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States;

“To establish post offices and post roads; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. “. . . to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. “. . . to constitute tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

“To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offences against the law of nations; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. “. . . to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water;

“To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GRAHAM).

Ms. GRAHAM. “. . . to provide and maintain a navy;

“To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;

“To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Mr. NEWHOUSE. “. . . to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. “. . . to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. “. . . and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.”

Section 9:

“The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each person.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. “The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it.

“No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed.

“No capitation, or other direct, tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration herein before directed to be taken.

“No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. “No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another; nor shall vessels bound to, or from, one State, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay duties in another.

“No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. “No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States: and no person holding any office of profit or trust under them, shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept of any present, emolument, office, or title, of any kind whatever, from any king, prince, or foreign state.”

Section 10:

“No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation; grant letters of marque and reprisal; coin money; emit bills of credit; make any thing but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts; pass any bill of attainder, ex post facto law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts, or grant any title of nobility.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. “No State shall, without the consent of the Congress, lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection laws: and the net produce of all duties and imposts, laid by any State on imports or exports, shall be for the use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such laws shall be subject to the revision and controul of the Congress.

“No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops, or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power, or engage in war, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Article II, section 1:

“The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of four years, and, together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected, as follows:

“Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: but no Senator or Representative, or person holding an office or trust or profit under the United States, shall be appointed an elector.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES).

Mr. FORBES. “The Congress may determine the time of chusing the electors, and the day on which they shall give their votes; which day shall be the same throughout the United States.

“No person except a natural born citizen, or a citizen of the United States, at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of President; neither shall any person be eligible to that office who shall not

have attained to the age of thirty five years, and been fourteen years a resident within the United States.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. “The President shall, at stated times, receive for his services, a compensation, which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive within that period any other emolument from the United States, or any of them.

“Before he enter on the execution of his office, he shall take the following oath or affirmation:—‘I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.’”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN).

Mr. PAULSEN. Section 2:

“The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States; he may require the opinion, in writing, of the principal officer in each of the executive departments, upon any subject relating to the duties of their respective offices, and he shall have power to grant reprieves and pardons for offences against the United States, except in cases of impeachment.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. “He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law: . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. “. . . but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.

“The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Section 3:

“He shall from time to time give the Congress information of the State of

the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient;

“He may, on extraordinary occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in case of disagreement between them, with respect to the time of adjournment, he may adjourn them to such time as he shall think proper; . . .”

□ 0945

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. “. . . he shall receive ambassadors and other public ministers; he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and shall commission all the officers of the United States.”

Section 4:

“The President, Vice President and all civil officers of the United States, shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Article III, section 1:

“The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their offices during good behaviour, and shall, at stated times, receive for their services a compensation, which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Section 2:

“The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority;—to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls;—to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK).

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. “. . . to controversies to which the United States shall be a party;—to controversies between two or more States,—between citizens of different States,—between citizens of the same State claiming lands under grants of different States, and between a State, or the citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens or subjects.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. “In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a State shall be party, the supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all other cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such ex-

ceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. “The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury; and such trial shall be held in the State where the said crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the trial shall be at such place or places as the Congress may by law have directed.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. Section 3:

“Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. “The Congress shall have power to declare the punishment of treason, but no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood, or forfeiture except during the life of the person attainted.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT).

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Article IV, section 1:

“Full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general laws prescribe the manner in which such acts, records and proceedings shall be proved, and the effect thereof.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Section 2:

“The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.

“A person charged in any State with treason, felony, or other crime, who shall flee from justice and be found in another State, shall on demand of the executive authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having jurisdiction of the crime.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Section 3:

“New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. “The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respect-

ing the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Section 4:

“The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened), against domestic violence.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Article V:

“The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several States . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. “. . . or by conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS).

Mr. VARGAS. Article VI:

“All debts contracted and engagements entered into, before the adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM).

Mr. ABRAHAM. “This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any thing in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. “The Senators and Representatives before mentioned,

and the members of the several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Article VII:

"The ratification of the conventions of nine States, shall be sufficient for the establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the same."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR).

Mr. MOOLENAAR. "Done in convention by the unanimous consent of the States present the seventeenth day of September in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and eighty seven and of the independence of the United States of America the twelfth in witness whereof we have hereunto subscribed our names."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. George Washington, President and deputy from Virginia.

Delaware: George Read, Gunning Bedford, Jr., John Dickinson, Richard Bassett, Jacob Broom.

Maryland: James McHenry, Daniel of St Thomas Jenifer, Daniel Carroll.

Virginia: John Blair, James Madison, Jr.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. North Carolina: William Blount, Richard Dobbs Spaight, Hugh Williamson.

South Carolina: John Rutledge, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Charles Pinckney, Pierce Butler.

Georgia: William Few, Abraham Baldwin.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. New Hampshire: John Langdon, Nicholas Gilman.

Massachusetts: Nathaniel Gorham, Rufus King.

Connecticut: William Samuel Johnson, Roger Sherman.

New York: Alexander Hamilton.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY).

Mrs. ROBY. New Jersey: William Livingston, David Brearley, William Paterson, Jonathan Dayton.

Pennsylvania: Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Mifflin, Robert Morris, George Clymer, Thomas FitzSimons, Jared Ingersoll, James Wilson, Gouverneur Morris.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN).

Ms. HAHN. Amendment I:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or

prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Amendment II:

"A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Amendment III: "No soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law."

□ 1000

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

Mr. ROUZER. Amendment IV:

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY).

Mr. CARNEY. Amendment V:

"No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. ". . . nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

Mr. EMMER. Amendment VI:

"In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. ". . . and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be con-

fronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defence."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Amendment VII:

"In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS), the Republican Conference chair.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Amendment VIII:

"Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Amendment IX:

"The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Amendment X:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Amendment XI:

"The judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by citizens of another State, or by citizens or subjects of any foreign state."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

Mr. FLORES. Amendment XII:

"The electors shall meet in their respective States and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice-President, . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. ". . . and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice-President, and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate; . . ."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. “. . . the President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted;—the person having the greatest number of votes for President, shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as President. . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. “. . . the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a Member or Members from two-thirds of the States, and a majority of all the States shall be necessary to a choice.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

Ms. GRANGER. “The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice-President, shall be the Vice-President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed, and if no person have a majority, then from the two highest numbers on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice-President; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

Ms. TSONGAS. “. . . a quorum for the purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. But no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice-President of the United States.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS. Amendment XIII, section 1:

“Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.”

Section 2:

“Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE).

Mrs. LOVE. Amendment XIV, section 1:

“All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of

the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Section 2:

“Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. “But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the Members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Section 3:

“No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a Member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. “. . . or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO).

Mr. VALADAO. Section 4:

“The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. “But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebel-

lion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Section 5:

“The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.”

Amendment XV, section 1:

“The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER).

Mr. YODER. Section 2:

“The Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.”

Amendment XVI:

“The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Amendment XVII:

“The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

“When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS).

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. “. . . provided, that the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

“This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.

□ 1015

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Amendment XIX:

“The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

“Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Amendment XX:

Section 1:

“The terms of the President and the Vice President shall end at noon on the 20th day of January, and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the 3d day of January, of the years in which such terms would have ended if this article had not been ratified; and the terms of their successors shall then begin.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Section 2:

“The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the 3d day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Section 3:

“If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President elect shall have died, the Vice President elect shall become President. If a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Vice President elect shall act as President until a President shall have qualified; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH. “. . . and the Congress may by law provide for the case wherein neither a President elect nor a Vice President shall have qualified, declaring who shall then act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President shall have qualified.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Section 4:

“The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Section 5:

“Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect on the 15th day of October following the ratification of this article.”

Section 6:

“This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY).

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Amendment XXI:

Section 1:

“The eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.”

Section 2:

“The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. Section 3:

“This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Amendment XXII:

Section 1:

“No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than two years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of President more than once.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. “But this article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this article was proposed by Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT).

Ms. PLASKETT. Section 2:

“This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TIPTON).

Mr. TIPTON. Amendment XXIII:

Section 1:

“The District constituting the seat of government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as Congress may direct:

“A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; . . .”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

Mr. BUCK. “. . . they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the twelfth article of amendment.”

Section 2:

“The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE. Amendment XXIV:

Section 1:

“The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay poll tax or other tax.”

Section 2:

“The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO).

Mr. LOBIONDO. Amendment XXV:

Section 1:

“In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.”

Section 2:

“Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Section 3:

“Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Section 4:

“Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.”

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. "Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

Mr. HURD of Texas. "Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Amendment XXVI:
Section 1:

"The right of citizens of the United States, who are eighteen years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Section 2:

"The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY).

Mr. VEASEY. Amendment XXVII:
"No law, varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives, shall take effect, until an election of Representatives shall have intervened."

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to revise and extend remarks and insert omitted material in the RECORD during the reading of the Constitution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 26. An act to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the First Special Service Force, in recognition of its superior service during World War II.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 70-770, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, announces the appointment of the following individual to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission:

The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH).

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 95-277, as amended by the appropriate provisions of Public Law 102-246, and in consultation with the Majority Leader, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, announces the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board for a five year term:

George Marcus of California, vice Elaine Wynn.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 28 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1104

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) at 11 o'clock and 4 minutes a.m.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 3.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 19, I call up the bill (H.R. 3) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 19, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Keystone XL Pipeline Act".

SEC. 2. KEYSTONE XL APPROVAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. may construct, connect, operate, and maintain the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in the application filed on May 4, 2012, by TransCanada Corporation to the Department of State (including any subsequent revision to the pipeline route within the State of Nebraska required or authorized by the State of Nebraska).

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State in January 2014, regarding the pipeline referred to in subsection (a), and the environmental analysis, consultation, and review described in that document (including appendices) shall be considered to fully satisfy—

(1) all requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(2) any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review (including the consultation or review required under section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536(a))) with respect to the pipeline and facilities referred to in subsection (a).

(c) PERMITS.—Any Federal permit or authorization issued before the date of enactment of this Act for the pipeline and cross-border facilities referred to in subsection (a) shall remain in effect.

(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Except for review in the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction over any civil action for the review of an order or action of a Federal agency regarding the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a), and the related facilities in the United States, that are approved by this Act (including any order granting a permit or right-of-way, or any other agency action taken to construct or complete the project pursuant to Federal law).

(e) PRIVATE PROPERTY SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this Act alters any Federal, State, or local process or condition in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that is necessary to secure access from an owner of private property to construct the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 15 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I enthusiastically rise today to support H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. And for those who have not heard, according to the administration, the

final hurdle has been removed, and that is that the Nebraska Supreme Court this morning has approved the pathway for the pipeline, the routing of the pipeline, the Keystone XL pipeline.

Again, the administration has said that was the major hurdle. It has fallen. So I hope the President is not going to establish another hurdle, that being himself.

America is undergoing an energy renaissance, and the prospect of securing North American energy independence is in sight. However, to achieve our goal of energy security, we need to make sure we have the infrastructure in place to keep pace with the changing energy landscape. Keystone will be a critical addition to the Nation's pipeline network, increasing our supply of oil and helping to reduce its cost.

The State Department completed its environmental analysis a year ago. However, there has still been no action by the administration on the pipeline.

There is simply no reason to delay this important project. As I mentioned, the President's main argument in this premature veto threat is that the bill would authorize the pipeline despite uncertainty due to ongoing litigation in Nebraska. Well, that uncertainty has ended this morning, and the Supreme Court of Nebraska has allowed the planned route to go forward in Nebraska. Again, there is simply no reason to delay. In fact, the southern leg of the pipeline has already been built.

In March 2012, in Oklahoma, the President expressed his support for expediting construction for the southern leg of the Keystone pipeline, and I agree with the President when he stated at that ceremony that he was directing his administration to cut through red tape, break through bureaucratic hurdles, and make this project a priority to go ahead and get it done. It was the right thing to do then, it is the right thing to do now, and it is exactly what this bill does.

We should move forward because this pipeline will be a tremendous boon to the economic development and one that doesn't require a single Federal dollar. The very nature of infrastructure improvement creates jobs, and Keystone is no exception.

I know my colleagues have made the argument that it is only temporary, but every infrastructure job is a temporary job. When a road is completed, when a bridge is completed, when a pipeline is completed, those construction workers move on to hopefully other construction jobs.

Indeed, five unions representing over 3 million workers—and I repeat that to my Democratic colleagues, five unions representing 3 million hardworking Americans—support this project, and I would like to submit their letter in the RECORD for support of this project.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD
OF TEAMSTERS,

Washington, DC, November 17, 2014.

U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to express the support of the International Brotherhood of

Teamsters for S. 2280, a bill to approve the Keystone XL pipeline. The Keystone XL Pipeline project has been subjected to over six and one-half years of scrutiny, including review by 10 federal agencies, as well as numerous state and local agency reviews. We believe that it is time to end the delay and to move forward with the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. We ask you to support S. 2280 when it comes to the Senate floor this week.

The Teamsters Union believes that the Keystone XL Pipeline will contribute to enhanced energy security, economic prosperity and, of critical importance, the creation of good paying jobs. Unemployment in the building and construction workforce remains too high. Construction of the pipeline will provide much needed and good paying jobs for this workforce. The utilization of a project labor agreement will enhance the safety, technical performance, reliability and quality of the project as well as maximize employment opportunities for local residents along the proposed corridor. Further, the fifty-seven special conditions agreed to for the project will provide an even greater degree of safety than any typically constructed domestic oil pipeline.

If the pipeline is not built, important socioeconomic benefits will not be realized—the positive impacts of local, state and federal revenue, spending by construction workers, and spending on construction goods and services. Building the Keystone XL Pipeline will enhance U.S. energy and economic security. It is time to move forward without further delay.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. HOFFA,
General President.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF
OPERATING ENGINEERS,

Washington, DC, September 17, 2013.

HON. JOHN HOEVEN,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

HON. MARY L. LANDRIEU,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS HOEVEN AND LANDRIEU: The International Union of Operating Engineers supports your amendment to energy-efficiency legislation, S. 1392, which simply expresses congressional support for the Keystone XL pipeline.

The International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE) represents approximately 400,000 skilled American and Canadian heavy-equipment operators and other craftworkers, including thousands of members who hope to build the Keystone XL pipeline. The IUOE is one of four unions signatory to the National Pipeline Agreement.

To create jobs and improve American energy independence, the Keystone XL pipeline should become a key part of America's energy infrastructure. The economic benefits of the project are dramatic and undisputable. The State Department's Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) says that approximately 10,000 construction workers would be employed building the pipeline, including thousands of Operating Engineers. A total of 42,100 jobs throughout the United States would be supported by the project, generating over \$2 billion in total earnings. All told, this pipeline project would contribute approximately \$3.4 billion to America's Gross Domestic Product.

The Keystone XL will also be one of the safest pipelines ever built. According to the EIS, the fifty-seven special conditions developed by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration and voluntarily agreed to by TransCanada ". . . would have a degree of safety greater than any typically

constructed domestic oil pipeline system under current regulations." In addition, the Operating Engineers and other union construction trades tasked with building the 1,179 mile pipeline possess the highest safety and skill levels in the pipeline sector.

Operating Engineers have waited over five years to build this essential piece North American energy infrastructure. Every state along the pipeline route has approved the project. Over 80 percent of Americans believe it's in our national interest to build it. Now it's time for the federal government to approve the project. Congress can send a strong message by supporting your amendment.

The IUOE endorses the Hoeven-Landrieu amendment in support of Keystone XL, and looks forward to working with you to see it passed into law.

Thank you again for your leadership.

Sincerely

JAMES T. CALLAHAN,
General President.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF
OPERATING ENGINEERS,

Washington, DC, January 7, 2015.

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

HON. NANCY PELOSI,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND LEADER PELOSI: The International Union of Operating Engineers supports the passage of H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act, and respectfully requests that you vote for the legislation on Friday when it will be considered on the floor of the House of Representatives.

After five different Environmental Impact Statements and over six years of evaluation, the Keystone XL pipeline has been the most exhaustively reviewed pipeline in history. All of the federal studies have reached the same conclusion: The Keystone XL pipeline merits approval. It is time for Congress to act and approve the Keystone XL pipeline.

As you know, the International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE) proudly represents heavy equipment operators and mechanics in the construction industry throughout the United States and Canada. A large cadre of our members possess specialized training and years of practical experience building oil and gas pipeline infrastructure. Members on both sides of the border hope to build the Keystone XL. Members of the Operating Engineers, through the collective bargaining process, will earn roughly \$35 an hour on their checks as they build the Keystone XL. The project is expected to generate approximately 3,000 job-years for Operating Engineers alone. With congressional approval of the pipeline, you can unleash this massive economic activity—at no cost to taxpayers.

The misguided criticism of the pipeline by the environmental community does not change the facts. Virtually the whole critique depends on a fundamental misunderstanding of the oil-transportation industry and its economics. Despite the conclusion of five different environmental studies, critics of the project refuse to accept that Keystone XL has little or no effect on the extraction rate of oil sands. Alternative transportation methods will step in to move the commodity, irrespective of the Keystone XL decision. The oil and gas industry possesses too much operational flexibility to allow one pipeline to limit the extraction rates of oil sands in Western Canada. Rail and other pipeline alternatives are ready to move oil sands and Bakken crude.

The Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration has ensured that Keystone XL will be safer than any other domestic oil pipeline system built under current

code as a result of its required 59 Special Conditions. These conditions usually accompany pipeline requirements in a "High-Consequence Area"—steep slope, for example. Yet these conditions will apply across the entirety of the Keystone XL pipeline. The conditions relate to everything from manufacturing specifications of pipe, to construction techniques, to post-construction monitoring.

This \$5 billion privately-funded pipeline will move an essential North American commodity more safely than other alternatives. It will also grow the economy by putting thousands of Operating Engineers and other construction workers back on the job.

The International Union of Operating Engineers respectfully requests your support for H.R. 3, legislation to approve the Keystone XL pipeline. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

JAMES T. CALLAHAN,
General President.

Mr. SHUSTER. I want to name them off. It is the Teamsters; it is the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; it is the Laborers' International Union of North America; it is the Operating Engineers; it is the pipefitters of the United States and Canada all supporting this project. Again, they see it as positive economic impact.

When these jobs are completed, they will move on to other, hopefully, construction jobs; but what is left behind will have a positive impact to our economy, to job creation for a generation.

Our energy renaissance is helping make North America more secure and energy independent, and, in fact, I want to quote the President:

In this time of significant political uncertainty in key oil-producing countries and regions, and in the context of a difficult economic situation, non-OPEC Canada crude oil supplies advance the energy security of the United States.

Now, I wish he would have said that about this pipeline, but he didn't. He said it in 2009 about the Enbridge pipeline, which started transferring oil sands from Canada to the gulf coast last month. The President, 5 years ago, supported this type of thing. He should support it now. So other than politics, I don't understand why he hasn't approved this project as he did with Enbridge. It is time to build.

Ladies and gentlemen, I especially look to my Democratic colleagues. Let's put down our gloves. Let's do something positive for America, for those 3 million union workers that are out there supporting this. Let's do what is good for the environment. Let's do what is good for energy independence.

Finally, let's be fair to our greatest friends in the world, our Canadian neighbors. They allowed us to build a pipeline across their land. We should allow them to do the same in ours. They are our best allies. They are our greatest friends. They are a great neighbor. So let us, today, pass this bill and build the Keystone pipeline.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Well, it is Groundhog Day come early to the floor of the House. It is cold enough I guess for Groundhog Day, but this will be the 10th time in the last 4 years that the House of Representatives has moved this bill with the assertion that somehow it leads us to energy independence, energy security, lower prices at the pump.

Well, the reality is a Canadian corporation is going to build a pipeline from Canada to Texas. They are going to be exempt from paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, unlike most other projects in this country, because of a stupid ruling by the IRS—but that is nothing new—regarding tar sands. So they will be exempt from paying into that. So if this thing bursts, there is an accident, the taxpayers of the United States get the bill, not the taxpayers of Canada. They don't get the bill. The taxpayers of the United States get the bill. Now, that is one of a number of problems regarding this project.

It is somewhat unprecedented, I believe. This may have happened at some other time in American history, but I do find it particularly ironic today, when we had the reading of the Constitution, that the effect of passing this bill, if it were to become law—and the President has already said he will veto it. But if this were to become law, the effect would be to give a foreign corporation the right to take private property from American citizens.

I am not aware of any other time in the history of the Union where we have given a foreign corporation the right to take Americans' private property. And, yes, some people were happy to sell the rights, but many others weren't, including some in Nebraska and some in Texas. It has been quite contentious among landowners who are just having this corporation come.

I would like to put in the RECORD a letter from TransCanada. We have blacked out the name of the recipient of the letter, but it is a true copy of a letter to a person who will have their private property taken by eminent domain by a foreign corporation, and the foreign corporation informs them that they will begin proceedings this month, I guess because of the anticipated Republican action, to take their private property away.

TRANSCANADA.

Omaha, NE, December 8, 2014

Re Keystone XL Project Update.

DEAR LANDOWNER: While we continue to wait for decisions from the Nebraska Supreme Court and from the U.S. Department of State regarding our proposed Keystone XL Pipeline, I would like to provide you with an update on our project.

To date, Nebraska landowners have voluntarily granted us easements representing 84 percent of the required right-of-way for the Keystone XL Pipeline Project. We continue to work to acquire the remaining land rights. In Montana and South Dakota, we have acquired easements for 100 percent of the privately owned right-of-way.

Between September 2008 and earlier this year, five successive sets of extensive public comments were taken and five successive

independent environmental assessments were published by the State Department. Each review confirmed the safety and environmental soundness of the project. The State Department is continuing its review of our Presidential Permit application and will ultimately make a determination whether the project is in the national interest. The State Department has not announced a definitive timeline for reaching that decision.

In addition, reviews have been completed separately by the States of Montana, Nebraska and South Dakota. As with the federal reviews, these state reviews included extensive public input. Each resulted in state approval of the project.

In South Dakota, the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission approved the project in 2010. Because construction did not begin within four years, we must certify that the pipeline continues to meet the conditions upon which the permit was issued. We have initiated the certification process and we expect a decision in 2015.

The State of Nebraska enacted legislation in 2011 and in 2012 requiring state review of the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline route. The Governor approved the route in January 2013, after a year-long public review process overseen by the Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality. Following a legal challenge of the new law, a lower court determined that the law was not valid and that the review should have been overseen by the Nebraska Public Service Commission. The Nebraska Attorney General appealed the lower court ruling to the Nebraska Supreme Court and the Court is expected to make a ruling later this year or early next year.

Pending a decision on the appeal, the law remains in effect as does the resulting Keystone XL route. In the event that the Nebraska Supreme Court affirms the lower court ruling invalidating the new law, we would expect a second Nebraska review to be required, this time by the Nebraska Public Service Commission.

If instead, the Nebraska Supreme Court reverses the lower court ruling, affirming the validity of the existing state review, we expect that other aspects of that law would remain in effect as well. One of those aspects affects the timing available to complete negotiations to acquire remaining property rights in Nebraska. If parties ultimately are not able to reach voluntary agreement on acquisition of necessary land rights for the project, we are required to commence the legal process of eminent domain to obtain those rights within two years of the January 2013 Nebraska approval.

We recognize that the Supreme Court ruling may not be issued before we are required to take action in preparation for the existing January 2015 deadline. While we would prefer not to initiate the process to acquire outstanding land rights while there is uncertainty, we are bound by that deadline in order to meet our responsibility to continue to prepare to build the pipeline necessary to safely transport North American energy.

Regardless of your perspective on the project, we would welcome the opportunity to address your questions and concerns and discuss property-specific details for pipeline construction. When we are able to work with landowners to achieve mutual agreement where possible, we are better able to minimize potential effects of construction on land and operations.

A member of my land team will follow-up with you or your legal counsel. If you have not heard from us or if you have questions, you are welcome to contact me. If you would like to see an operating pipeline, please let us know and we'd be happy to arrange for a

tour of a pump station on the operating Keystone line in Nebraska.

Sincerely,

ANDREW CRAIG,
*Manager—Land, Keystone Projects,
 TransCanada Pipelines, USA.*

Mr. DEFAZIO. Now, that is a bit ironic, again, on the day we read the Constitution and also of the party of individual rights for property owners. So that is also of concern.

Yes, there will be construction jobs, and I am the first to admit we need more jobs in America. In fact, I voted against the President's so-called stimulus bill because it didn't invest enough in building infrastructure in this country. Instead, it did a whole bunch of stupid tax cuts because of Larry Summers, a highly acclaimed hack economist, and we didn't put a lot of people back to work. Seven percent went to infrastructure, that created jobs; 42 percent went to tax cuts, didn't create jobs. But that is another agenda the Republicans are pursuing is tax cuts to create jobs, but we won't get into that here today.

So, yes, that will happen, but there are a lot of other investments we should, could, and I believe the chairman supports making that will create significant construction and infrastructure jobs.

Now, were this just in isolation and it didn't involve the total destruction of the boreal forests of Canada, if I were Canadian I would be pretty upset about that; and perhaps the dirtiest, most environmentally problematic way of extracting fossil fuels from the ground to get these oil sands, the construction jobs might carry the day, but sometimes you have to draw a line.

In this case, we also hear it is going to lead somehow to energy security. Well, that is interesting because the crude, tar sand oil, or whatever you want to call it, is going to come down to Texas without paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund—creating a potential problem for the future taxpayers of the United States—go to a refinery in an export zone in Texas, and, yes, it will be refined and then it will be exported.

We are exporting millions of gallons of fuel every day, so to somehow say this is going to lead to lower prices at the pump in America—maybe it is lower prices at the pump in China or I don't know where else, Japan or someplace, but it isn't going to be here because the product is ultimately going to be exported. So it is also not going to do anything for our energy security, and at the moment we have kind of a surfeit because of fracking and other things of fuels, and prices are down considerably.

□ 1115

So those are just a few of the problems.

And by passing this bill, the House of Representatives will attempt to preempt the executive authority of the President in this matter because this pipeline crosses an international bor-

der. The President has authority, and the State Department has been considering it.

And even with the Supreme Court of Nebraska refusing to make a judgment, they didn't uphold the law of the Nebraska legislature. In fact, four out of seven judges—normally a majority in most places—said it was unconstitutional, but Nebraska has a peculiarity that if the other three judges take a walk—which they did—then even though a majority found it unconstitutional, it is not found unconstitutional, and that is the end of the proceeding.

So that is the big news out of Nebraska. They need a little work on their constitution, I think. So it hasn't received a stamp of approval there. There are still aggrieved landowners in Nebraska who object to the route and who are going to have their private property taken by a foreign corporation. So other than that, it is a great idea.

And with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I just want to remind my Democratic colleagues that, first of all, I am from Pennsylvania. Punxsutawney is several miles outside of my district. That is where Punxsutawney Phil resides. So I am somewhat knowledgeable on Groundhog Day. And I just want to point out to my Democratic colleagues that in the movie "Groundhog Day," Bill Murray learned from his mistakes the day before and improved his situation each day. So hopefully today, your references to your learning from yesterday and how we can move forward—I think the Nebraska situation improves the whole situation for all of us. And I certainly don't question the wisdom of the Nebraska Supreme Court.

And with that, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill as vice chair of the Pipeline Subcommittee.

Pipelines are the single safest way to transport liquids—safer than rail, safer than trucks. The State Department says Keystone would have a minimal impact on the environment.

President Obama and his administration have confirmed that Keystone will create thousands of construction jobs. These are men and women's livelihoods.

Respectfully, I would remind the administration, but by their nature, all construction jobs are temporary. And it is insulting to marginalize the value of these jobs or the people who might hold them.

Keystone is supported by many unions, including mine, Local 545, the Operating Engineers, where I have been for almost 35 years.

Prime Minister Stephen Harper of Canada said, and I agree, that Keystone is in both of our nations' interests and that "the logic here is overwhelming."

Keystone will help us stop sending billions and billions of dollars overseas to our enemies, many of whom would harm us.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to start building this Keystone pipeline.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, could you tell me how much time remains of the 15 minutes that I had?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD). Each side has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. With that, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I thank the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to what can only be described as an earmark for a Canadian corporation. It speaks volumes about the Republican agenda, as this new Congress convenes, that the first order of business in the House and Senate is to rubberstamp the Keystone XL pipeline.

We have not dealt with unemployment benefits that the American people need that have lapsed for more than a year. Millions of Americans are suffering from a low minimum wage and income disparity, but we are not helping them. Women in this country still only earn 77 cents to every dollar their male counterparts earn, but we are not trying to end that disparity.

Instead, they are forcing Keystone through without the proper approval process. Building a pipeline clear across the United States so that TransCanada can sell its dirty tar sands oil to the highest bidder—namely China—is not in the American people's best interests.

We take on the risk to our lands, the American people face threats to their health, and TransCanada gets to reap the rewards. That is not a winning formula for our country or the economy. In fact, it is a sham.

And yet the Keystone XL pipeline continues to be sold to the American people on blatantly false pretenses. We are told by proponents that this is about job creation, yet not a single independent analysis supports these claims.

The burden of proof is on the GOP. They pull fantastic claims out of thin air, and yet they refuse to back them up. Instead, we are told to take their assertions at face value.

Here is what we actually know. These are the facts that can actually be substantiated:

The State Department found in its supplemental environmental impact study of the Keystone pipeline that it will generate less than 2,000 jobs a year for 2 years and only during the period of construction. Once the pipeline is built, these jobs will disappear, leaving a mere 35 permanent jobs that will result from this project—35. To put that in context, under President Obama, 353,000 jobs were generated in November and a total of 2.9 million in 2014.

There is also the claim that it is going to lower gas prices for the American people. Please. Gas prices have been dropping for more than 100 straight days and are at the lowest level in more than 5½ years. They won't go any lower by allowing oil to be piped across our country just to be sold abroad.

In contrast to fantasy impacts on gas prices, the potential impacts on our environment are very real. Not only will burning these tar sands add to global climate change, but any leak, failure, or, God forbid, explosion will have disastrous impacts on our environment. And because tar sands importers are exempt from paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, the American taxpayers will have to bear the cost of cleaning up any spills.

The public needs to know these facts, and that is why allowing 1 hour of debate with not a single, solitary amendment today robs the American people of a full debate and discussion.

On top of all that, this bill is being pushed through despite the fact that it violates not one but two treaties with American Indian nations.

What does this say about the GOP's respect for the rule of law?

If the Republicans truly want to generate jobs for the American people, they should fully fund the highway trust fund and support the GROW AMERICA Act to invest in the crumbling infrastructure all across this country, not help Canadians build a superhighway for their dirty tar sands oil.

We would be supporting not just 2,000 jobs per year for 2 years but millions of jobs for American families, across every congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have a chance to take an important stand today early in this Congress on behalf of taxpayers, the environment, Native American communities, and the rule of law by supporting President Obama's veto and rejecting this toxic giveaway to foreign corporate oil interests.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I just want to say that there have been 15 hearings on the Keystone pipeline. This is the 10th time we have debated it on the floor. This, quite possibly, could be the most debated piece of legislation in the history of Congress. I don't know that for sure. But I do know that it has been out there for 2,303 days, and 60 percent of the American people support it, while 20 percent don't support it. So I think the American people are fully aware of what is going on here. They understand it, and they do support it.

With that, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

Mr. EMMER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Keystone pipeline, which will safely move 300 million barrels annually, strengthen our economy, continue

to decrease our dependence on Mideast oil, and support thousands of jobs.

This body has shown tremendous leadership on this issue and last year passed bipartisan legislation to approve Keystone for the ninth time. Today, with strong support from unions, businesses, and the American people, we must pass it again.

I am grateful for Representative CRAMER, Chairman SHUSTER, Chairman UPTON, and the leadership for their work on this vital legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman just referenced safely transport. Of course that is a hypothetical. And let me give a real example:

In 2010, a Canadian company, Enbridge, had a pipeline burst in Marshall, Michigan, spilling 1 million gallons of tar sands oil.

Now, here is the thing. All oil has viscosity and other characteristics. The thing about tar sands oil is, it doesn't float. It goes right to the bottom. They are still dredging Canadian tar sands oil out of the bottom of the Kalamazoo River 4 years later. And so far, claims of \$53 million have been made, which will have to be paid by American taxpayers against the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and not by Enbridge, the Canadian corporation.

Which is what we are setting up here: an even greater transshipment by a foreign corporation, exempt from paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, creating even bigger potential for spills with this oil, which has unique characteristics which are much more difficult to clean up if it comes in contact with water and, God forbid, it gets into the aquifer in one of the States that are being transected.

The chairman did reference the 15 hearings. We have a difference in counting. But let's say 15 hearings. Three were in the Rules Committee. Those aren't hearings. That is sort of a little star chamber where you take things before you bring them to the floor of the House. You don't discuss substance there. One was in the Senate. There were 10 in the House, but not a single one of those hearings was in the principal committee of jurisdiction, which would be the Transportation Committee. And of course the bill that was marked up by the Transportation Committee in the first session of the last Congress was very different than the bill that is being advocated for today, which has not been marked up.

And we heard a lot about regular order, read the bill, and all that stuff. It is fine to say, gee, we have voted on this a lot of times before. With 61 new Members of the House, gas prices are down by almost 50 percent, a lot of things have changed. I would even wonder about the viability of this project.

I did just recently learn that the Koch brothers, though, have a significant investment in tar sands in Canada. But that probably has nothing to

do with an attempt to expedite this project.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I would just like to remind the distinguished ranking member of the Transportation Committee, arguably the most knowledgeable man in Congress when it comes to transportation issues, with many years of service plus an intellect that is very sharp—I would never presume to tell him—I just want to remind him that the safest way to move product, to move oil is by pipeline. And I think the gentleman knows that, but I just wanted to remind him of that.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just heard a word that is almost hard to believe. We have been accused of expediting this process. Ladies and gentlemen, this is day 2,303 of this process. It is time now.

It is time because it is good for job creation. It is time because it is good for the environment. It is not just the safest way, as the chairman said; the most environmentally sound way to move tar sands oil is in a pipeline. It is good for national security. It is good for economic security. It is good because 62.8 percent of labor force participation is the lowest since 1978. It creates jobs. And it is for these reasons that not only does the majority of the United States House and the majority of the United States Senate support it, but it is because of these reasons that the vast majority of the people of the United States support it, including the people of Nebraska. And for those reasons, I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 3.

Mr. DEFAZIO. At this moment, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

□ 1130

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the permitting for the Keystone pipeline has taken longer than it took for the United States to win World War II. Isn't that lovely?

The pipeline will bring oil to my home State of Texas. Pipelines are the safest way to transport oil. The Keystone will deliver as much oil as we get from Saudi Arabia. The United States should work more with our neighbors—our normal neighbors—Canada and Mexico to develop our national resources and compete with OPEC.

Mr. Speaker, this is a national security and energy security issue. We can make the Middle East, its politics, its oil, and its turmoil irrelevant. It is time to pick a horse and ride it.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

In response to the transport, yes, pipelines are generally safer, but the

consequences—look at the case in Michigan—when a pipeline goes are generally much greater, much greater volumes.

Even in the horrific train accidents we have had, the volumes were relatively small that were spilled, even though the consequences—particularly in the one in Canada—were very, very damaging. Minimally, you should have added to the bill requiring them to pay into the oil spill liability trust fund. That would make that slightly less objectionable.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. This bill is based on the Cassidy Keystone bill which passed the House last Congress on a bipartisan vote of 252–161.

As Chairman SHUSTER noted, this pipeline will create jobs, enhance our energy independence, and strengthen our national security.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that makes numerous project benefits a reality. According to the Department of Energy, the pipeline will transport over 800,000 barrels per day of oil from Canada to the gulf coast, which will help reduce reliance on more hostile nations.

Some have argued that the oil will just be exported, but the administration's own environmental analysis denies that that will ever occur. It will also create good-paying jobs now, while promoting the growth of our energy economy for the future.

This is the most studied pipeline in our history. In the history of our Nation, we have never studied a pipeline like this. There is no need to continue to stall its approval. This project will be safe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, America currently has 2.6 million miles of pipeline providing an extremely safe way to transport energy products.

The Keystone pipeline will be the safest ever built, with 95 special mitigation measures, including nearly 60 recommended by the Department of Transportation. It is time to approve this project.

We can't afford any more delays. The American public deserves these jobs, and we deserve to be energy independent.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Thank you, Ranking Member.

Mr. Speaker, we know that building the Keystone pipeline will create some jobs, and it can even help lower consumers' prices, but many of these jobs are temporary, which is true in most

capital cases anyway. The price of oil has already fallen below \$50 a barrel for the first time since 2009.

We really got some good news about jobs today again. We added 252,000 jobs, and the unemployment rate is the lowest since 2008—I think May or June of that year.

While we are going in the right direction, we need some serious creation of jobs and at least a reach-out to the administration, “Hey, you are doing a pretty good job on this, on oil prices, on gasoline prices,” just a little bit of encouragement. We all roll on the same ship, come on.

You boost our energy security, and you save consumers money at the pump, but the debate over Keystone has become a symbolic issue. Come on, let's admit it. It is clear that this fight is vastly greater than the economic, environmental, or energy impact. It is the end of the world if you listen to the extremes of both sides.

I could support the construction of this pipeline but do not believe Congress should circumvent the administrative view.

Mr. Speaker, let me just recommend something perhaps through you to the Chair. I believe that the reason why we have this problem is the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has nothing to say about oil lines. They do on gas lines, but not oil lines.

I think we could have saved a lot of time if we used the same situation. I am going to vote “no” on this, but I think there is some good things that need to be done and could be worked out.

Mr. SHUSTER. It is now my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), a Nebraskan.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. I thank the chairman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, as you all know, a major portion of the Keystone XL pipeline will run through Nebraska's Third District. Nebraskans overwhelmingly support this project to improve access to North American energy and decrease the strain on our overwhelmed infrastructure system.

As we all now know, the Nebraska Supreme Court has upheld the process as established by the elected Nebraska officials.

I urge my colleagues to support approval of this project, and I urge the President to sign off on the pipeline as a needed step to encourage private investment in infrastructure.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is now my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK.)

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3, the Keystone XL pipeline. This bill is about good-paying jobs and energy security.

Republicans and many Democrats agree on this, as well as the unique coalition of unions like the Teamsters,

LIUNA, the Tea Party, as well as the Chamber of Commerce.

Listen to what the president of LIUNA said:

To the tens and thousands of men and women in the construction industry, this isn't just a pipeline; it is their mortgages, college tuitions, car payments, and food on the table. And for our country, this isn't just a pipeline; it's a lifeline to family security, energy security, and national security.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote for the passage of this critical, bipartisan bill.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation to authorize the building of the Keystone pipeline. It is time. Enough is enough. We agree, thousands of jobs would be created by this pipeline.

This will improve consumer prices. This will bring stability to oil markets around the world. This will contribute to protecting us here on American soil rather than relying on energy sources from hostile nations of the world. It doesn't cure all the problems, but it is a step in the right direction.

Our constituents sent us here, Mr. Speaker, to solve problems. This is part of the solution. I rise in support of the Keystone pipeline and ask all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reaffirm the bipartisan message of the last Congress and approve this legislation today.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Keystone XL pipeline, the most studied pipeline in American history.

After 6 years and 22,000 pages of review, the President's own State Department tells us that construction of this pipeline will support over 42,000 good-paying jobs and do nothing to harm the environment. Pipelines have been shown to be the safest way to transport oil.

Keystone has bipartisan, widespread support—Democrats, Republicans, industry leaders, and labor. Unfortunately, the President issued a veto threat, putting the wishes of environmental activists ahead of creating jobs for the American public.

Mr. Speaker, let's say “yes” to much-needed jobs and approve the Keystone pipeline without any further delays.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are exporting more than 60 percent of the oil that we produce every day either as refined or even as crude product. In this case, Canadian oil, exempt from a tax, will flow

through the United States to a refinery.

It will be processed and exported overseas. Somehow, that is going to lower prices further at the pump. Somehow, that is going to lead to American energy security.

You have to blow the dust off those arguments. They are a little dated, so we have raised a number of concerns here today.

Minimally—minimally—the Republicans should require this Canadian corporation to pay the same tax that most U.S. corporations pay when they transport products through pipelines and not put American taxpayers at risk.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, the final hurdle has been removed. The Nebraska Supreme Court has said that the Keystone pipeline can move forward. That should be enough for my Democratic colleagues.

But there is more. It is safe. It is the safest way to transport this oil, this natural resource. It is the most studied pipeline. It is going to be safe and environmentally sound. It will protect the environment. It creates jobs. Don't listen to me; listen to the five unions that represent 3 million workers. Three million union workers say the Keystone pipeline should be built.

Mr. Speaker, it provides energy security for us, it is good for our economy, and it helps our allies—it strengthens our allies, and it weakens our enemies.

The last point is it is fair to our best friends in the world, the Canadians, who have allowed us to build a pipeline from Alaska to the lower 48. We ought to return the favor to our best friend—our best ally—and say: “Yes, you can build a safe pipeline, you can build a pipeline that will help all of North America, that will help all of our allies around the world and weaken our enemies.”

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on H.R. 3, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Energy and Commerce Committee has shared jurisdiction over this issue with T&I, and we have a number of members that would like to speak on the issue as well.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, do you like cheap oil? Most Americans would say “yes,” and a number of us have strongly pursued a North American energy independence plan for years, and our friend, Canada, is a big part of that.

In August of 2009, President Obama signed off on a new pipeline called the Alberta Clipper. Guess what? It brings 400,000 barrels of oil a day from western Canada to the United States.

We have been waiting for the approval of the Keystone XL pipeline for years—over 6 in fact. I remember well

when President Obama promised to do whatever it takes to create American jobs. That was followed by a so-called year of action; yet here we are, 6 years later, and nothing has happened.

By the administration's own estimates, tens of thousands of jobs will be supported by this landmark project. Bringing oil from Canada to the U.S. displaces imports from Venezuela and the Middle East. Isn't that a good thing?

I also note that former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton signaled that she was inclined to support the project, and that was way back in 2010.

In fact, in the summer of 2011, the White House issued its first veto threat against congressional action on the Keystone XL, claiming that legislation was unnecessary because their process was working and a decision would be reached by the end of that year. Since then, we have upgraded new oil and gas pipeline standards, and Keystone will exceed those, Mr. President, as it should.

We used to be a nation of big ideas and big dreams. We imagined building the Hoover Dam and the Golden Gate Bridge and accomplished both in far less time than it has taken the President to muster the courage to simply say “yes” or “no.” We can do better.

The election, Mr. President, is over. There has been broad, bipartisan support for this project from the very first day. The President has been hiding behind the Nebraska court case to block the critical jobs project called Keystone XL, and with that contrived roadblock cleared, the White House is now out of excuses. Vote “yes.”

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) for a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3, a bill to approve the application for the construction of Keystone XL pipeline.

I rise in support of this bill because I support North American energy development.

Today, the Nebraska Supreme Court affirmed that Keystone XL should be built.

Keystone XL pipeline not the first cross-border pipeline project built in North America.

But if some opponents had their way, Keystone XL pipeline would be the last pipeline we built in North America.

Energy prices are at their lowest point in the last decade.

Energy imports from partners like Canada and Mexico, and domestic production, have put more than \$900 a year in the pockets of the American people.

Keystone XL will continue this success in a time of struggle.

The United States still imports approximately 40 percent of the oil we use domestically.

The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) has decided to directly challenge the new North American energy

market by maintaining, and in some cases, increasing production.

This is a direct affront to North American producers and an all-out price war.

This, however, is a struggle we can win, with the help of our North American partners.

Breakeven prices for North American crude, including Canadian oil sands and United States shale oil, are as low as \$40 per barrel.

Our producers can support our domestic demand while further driving out more expensive competitors.

Unfortunately, our domestic producers cannot win without cost-effective and environmentally sound transportation.

Keystone XL offers that advantage and I support it, although I do not believe H.R. 3 is the perfect legislation.

I believe that oil sands should be subject to the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

Almost every other source of crude oil that transits the United States is subject to the Trust Fund tax and oil sands should be as well.

It makes fiscal sense, it makes environmental sense and it makes competitive sense.

Oil sands should not be favored over any other sources in our country.

The Keystone XL pipeline is the most scrutinized project in as long as I can remember.

As we face the 114th Congress, we have real problems that require answers.

Keystone XL pipeline is good for the United States, it's good for North America and we should support this bill.

□ 1145

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we are voting once again to grant special treatment—and I stress “special treatment”—to TransCanada's Keystone XL pipeline. It is the 10th time since Republicans took control of the House.

American families face many pressing problems, and they want us to use this new Congress to work together to solve them. Unfortunately, we will begin this new year with a bill crafted solely to help the Canadian tar sands industry. The administration issued a statement in opposition to this legislation and indicated that the President will veto the bill. I heard my Republican colleagues talk about the action or inaction, whatever it was, by the Nebraska Supreme Court today; but I would stress that the White House press office still says in a statement that regardless of the Nebraska ruling today, the House bill still conflicts with longstanding executive branch procedures regarding the authority of the President and prevents the thorough consideration of complex issues that could bear on U.S. national interests, and if presented to the President he will veto the bill. So the bill will still be vetoed by the President, which is another indication why we are wasting our time today.

Mr. Speaker, oil prices are at their lowest level in more than 5 years. Gas prices are now below \$2 a gallon. Domestic U.S. oil production is skyrocketing. Tar sands are among the dirtiest and most carbon-intensive of

all fossil fuels. Approving the Keystone XL pipeline will create a dependence on tar sands crude, reversing the carbon pollution reductions we have been working so hard to accomplish. According to some experts, building the Keystone XL pipeline will triple production of the tar sands, and that is totally inconsistent with any future scenario for avoiding catastrophic climate change.

We don't need this oil. Approving and constructing this pipeline won't lower gas prices for Americans. In some areas, it may even raise prices. This pipeline is a terrible deal for the United States. We get all of the risk while the oil companies will reap all of the rewards.

I was at the Rules Committee the other night and all I kept hearing was how wonderful Canada is, how we have to help Canadian companies. This is all about Canada. Frankly, I don't know why we are so worried about a Canadian corporation. It wasn't clear during the Rules Committee hearing, based on the conversations and debate we had with the Republican side, that this pipeline would even ever be built. And yet here we are rushing to basically say to the President: We don't care what you or the State Department or the Department of the Interior says what is in the national interest; we are just going to do this because of some Canadian interest.

Mr. Speaker, this is a new year and a new Congress. We have new Members who will vote on this bill without the benefit of any hearings or markups or floor amendments, without the benefit of learning how our changing energy picture alters the need for this pipeline, and without considering whether our time might be better spent on efforts to promote other cleaner energy sources.

We need sound energy policy in these challenging times. As the ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, I am anxious to begin working with all of my colleagues on pragmatic energy policy; but we need a balanced energy policy, one that takes into account current circumstances, one that takes into account our need to combat climate change, and one that works with the President rather than against the President to actually deliver legislation that the President can sign rather than veto. This legislation doesn't meet any of these criteria, so I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my chairman and friend.

Mr. Speaker, I speak today as a former naval aviator who flew alongside Canadian Armed Forces as we won the cold war. We have no greater ally than our neighbor to the north—Canada. We were attacked on September 11

and went to war in Afghanistan; they went with us. To date, nearly 200 of their precious sons have come home in coffins. That is a true ally.

When Hurricane Katrina hit New Orleans in August 2005, within 3 days our neighbor to the north authorized three military vessels, a Coast Guard vessel, numerous planes, 25 military divers, and tons of tents, blankets, beds, water, and medical supplies. That is a true ally.

And yet this strong alliance is being weakened dramatically because President Obama has chosen to listen to a small group of wealthy radicals who want no drop of oil coming from our neighbor to the north—Canada.

In November, I met with officials from Canada, officials from all over, from Leeds-Grenville and Nova Scotia. They were dismayed because we are telling them: We don't want your oil; don't help us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. OLSON. It is a bad world, Mr. President, with terrorists in Paris, and ISIS. Terrorists hit our country from North Korea. We need strong allies.

Today, pick up two things, Mr. President:

Pick up the phone, dial Mr. HARPER and say: I am going to approve this pipeline;

After it passes in the Senate, pick up that pen and sign this bill into law.

Let's have a strong alliance with Canada forever.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds all Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), the ranking member of the Energy and Power Subcommittee.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this bill, and I strongly disagree with this abhorrent process that the majority side has undertaken in order to hastily bring H.R. 3 to the floor after only 1 hour of debate and denying the minority the ability to offer one single, solitary amendment.

Truth be told, Mr. Speaker, it is unclear how this legislation would actually be of benefit to the American people. A 2014 report by the State Department concluded that the Keystone pipeline would create 35 permanent, full-time domestic jobs, which is roughly the same amount of jobs that would be created by opening a new corner fast-food burger joint, albeit with more risk to the American environment.

And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, this bill is unnecessary because there is already an independent process that is taking place at this very moment, and H.R. 3 short-circuits this approval process.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, let it be fully understood by all Members of this

House, the President has indicated that he would veto this bill. This bill is dead on arrival if it ever reaches the President's desk.

The State Department has already released its final supplemental environmental impact statement and has begun the review period to determine whether the pipeline is in the national interest.

Mr. Speaker, more than 2.5 million Americans have contributed comments on how this foolhardy project would impact the national interest, and their voices, the voices of 2.5 million Americans, deserve to be heard.

I have said it before, Mr. Speaker, and I say it again: this bill is about seizing power away from the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. RUSH. This bill is about seizing power away from the American people by seizing power away from our duly-elected President. It will prevent the thorough, sober consideration of complex issues that could have serious security, safety, environmental, and other ramifications.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of this body to vote "no." The Keystone XL pipeline is a Republican pipe dream.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as we stand on the floor debating a bill to approve the Keystone pipeline, we all need to admit that we shouldn't be doing this. We should not have to be here today.

It is 2,303 days after the application for Keystone was first submitted to the State Department. We shouldn't be debating it; we should be building it.

For years, approval has been stuck in the Senate. Well, now the Senate is open. The Senate is changed. It moved through committee.

Mr. Speaker, for the longest time, the President hid behind the lengthy and delayed review process saying he wanted to wait to make a decision. He said he was waiting because of environmental and legal considerations. But Keystone won't harm the environment; it will help protect it. The people know that. Mr. Speaker, the President knows that.

Mr. Speaker, the President, before we even started the debate today, has submitted a threat of a veto. I take these seriously as a majority leader, so I wanted to read it. Mr. Speaker, one of the rationales why the President wants to veto it is because this bill also authorizes the project, despite uncertainty due to ongoing litigation in Nebraska. Well, hallelujah. We have good news for the President, Mr. Speaker. The Nebraska Supreme Court solved that problem for him today.

So we should move forward just as we have done before on a bipartisan basis.

Why? Because of 42,000 jobs. Those are American jobs created here, an economy continuing to move forward.

And rest assured, the oil in Canada will be produced. The question before us today: Will that oil move down through America, refined in American refineries, built by American women and men, or will it go to a whole other continent?

We take up many issues here on this floor, but we have to look to the future and we have to build for a strong future. I want North America to be energy independent. We all know the strength of that. I want an environmentally sound way to do it. Today does it.

I listened to the President's concerns, Mr. Speaker. We have had 2,303 days. We have studied it. Our departments have studied it. They have come back and said, environmentally, we are safe. There was a legal concern. Well, the Supreme Court dealt with that.

So today we can join together, just as we have done before, in a bipartisan manner and pass this bill. There is a change in the Senate with an open process. They can pass it there, and it can go to the desk and be signed so 42,000 Americans can get back to work.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, at the heart of this issue are two questions: First, is climate change real? Is it a threat to our economy, to jobs, to our environment, and to our security?

Speaking for Vermont, climate change is real. In the past 5 years, Vermont has had 10 Federal disaster declarations from severe weather, including Tropical Storm Irene that did nearly \$1 billion worth of damage. Our farmers, ski area operators, and maple sugar producers are all trying to contend with the changing climate.

□ 1200

Also, we know that that oil is the same. This is not sweet Texas crude. Tar sands produce about 20 to 40 percent more carbon emissions than that Texas oil, and extracting it is going to produce about 27 million metric tons of carbon emissions.

The second question is this: Should Congress now or should Congress ever pass a major piece of legislation without any committee hearings, particularly when that legislation is only about oil going through our country, not to our country?

And this legislation includes a special provision that exempts a foreign corporation from contributing to an environmental cleanup fund all our domestic corporations are required to pay into.

On the issue of jobs, these are good jobs, about 2,000 jobs. But if this Congress would do its job, we would pass a surface transportation bill that would create 200,000 jobs and put those 3 million men and women in our labor

unions to work on good things that are going to rebuild this country.

Mr. Speaker, this is the wrong bill, it is passed in the wrong way, and at exactly the wrong time.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the vice chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman from Kentucky for his tenacious work on this issue. This is the 10th time this has come to the floor and he has been diligent and has continued to push it, and we thank him for those efforts.

I have to tell you, listening to this debate, it just goes to show you why the American people are so tired of what they consider to be the political games that are played here in Washington.

They said they wanted us to come and get some things done. This is getting some things done. It is appropriate that we take up this bill today. And here is why: Do you realize 88 percent of all Americans support energy independence—88 percent? Sixty-five percent of all Americans think that building the Keystone pipeline is what this country should do.

Now, I have to tell you, I listen to the President and to the excuses that come out of the administration, and I think that with the Supreme Court decision in Nebraska today the President is out of excuses. He is out of excuses. He has run the gamut on it. No more excuses. It is time that we pass it, the Senate passes it, and that this legislation goes to the President's desk.

One of my colleagues said that being here on the floor today is a waste of time. I really disagree with that, Mr. Speaker. The President vetoing this legislation is a waste not only of the American people's time, but of the resources and the taxpayer money that come into the coffers for this government to function.

Create 20,000 new jobs, increase our energy supply, move us to energy independence. Pass the bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire as to how much time is available on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a labor economics jobs bill. The American people need jobs. The labor unions who founded and built the middle class of this Nation need jobs.

But, ladies and gentlemen, nobody needs jobs like young Black men. I see this as an opportunity here today. The highest unemployment rate is with Black young men. For Black young men between the ages of 19 and 35, the

unemployment rate is 38 percent—38 percent—and in some communities it is 50 percent.

That is why I come before you today. I support the bill. But I want you all to help me support an amendment. You all know the amendment process is going on over in the Senate.

Over in the Senate, Senator McCONNELL said he is open to amendments. Here is the amendment: the amendment would just put language in this bill that would put the apprenticeship programs, what they affectionately call "earn as you learn" on-the-job training—no Federal money—and target those and guide and direct and encourage in this language that our labor union partners bring in these young African American men to learn these trade building skills. Each of the labor unions are ready. They have the apprenticeship programs, they have them there.

We need this desperately, ladies and gentlemen. Do you know that sitting in the prisons right now are 1 million Black men. Every week, thousands of our Black men are going into prison. The number one reason: they don't have jobs. This is a jobs bill. Yeah, it has got maybe, some people say, 4,000, some people say 2,000, but there will be other jobs that they can learn these skills from when we rebuild our infrastructure.

You all have seen the sign. Black lives matter, but Black lives with jobs.

Help me get this amendment in on the Senate side and let's pass this bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3 and the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline.

Part of the existing pipeline system actually supplies the Wood River Refinery in the 12th Congressional District in Illinois.

In anticipation of the construction of this pipeline, the owners have spent \$4 billion upgrading the facility and created about 2,400 jobs over a 4-year period. Construction of the Keystone XL extension would deliver similar benefits to other regions of the country, creating over 42,000 jobs in construction, manufacturing, transportation, and services industries.

It is for these reasons that a diverse coalition of businesses and labor unions in the construction and building trades industries have come out in support of H.R. 3, and I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, how does this one project, the Keystone XL pipeline, get so much outsized attention? We currently have a sprawling, 185,000-mile network of oil pipelines in the United States and a regulatory process to ensure that they are operating safely.

So why are we spending so much time trying to exempt a Canadian company from the environmental reviews that every other company in America has to abide by?

And the big question, Mr. Speaker: Who will pay for any future oil spills? Not Keystone. This bill exempts Keystone from contributing the same 8 cents per barrel that every other oil company is required to pay into the oil spill trust fund.

Tell me, Mr. Speaker, why is this? If the authors are so certain that this pipeline does not carry any environmental risk, won't they allow the review process to run its course?

I stand with my colleagues. I want those jobs, I want them around the country. We can do this, we can do better.

I urge a "no" vote on this dangerous precedent, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I also want to say congratulations again to my friend Congressman PALLONE for assuming the ranking position. We look forward to working with you.

Today is a great day. This pipeline should have been approved 6 years ago, like so many other transnational pipelines in our history. A pipeline is the safest way to move bulk liquid product, more than any other means. It will be from an ally, a trusted ally. More crude oil on the world market lowers prices for everybody. It is more money in the individual citizen's pocket. It actually is a very great day.

Let's just debunk this myth. This oil is going to go in refineries in my district, MIKE BOST's district, Ohio, Indiana, and in the gulf coast. We are going to get the double effort because we are going to be able to refine this, put it on the U.S. market, and lower energy prices for all our citizens. It is a great day.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for bringing it to the floor.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition.

We have been promised thousands of jobs, but the U.S. State Department estimates that this will create only 35 permanent jobs. Yes, they will be construction jobs, but they are not permanent. They are for a year, maybe 2 years.

Let's be clear about what we are getting with Keystone: a dirty and dangerous pipeline running through the heart of our country which will help Canadian oil companies export their oil, and it happens to be the filthiest possible energy form.

I would like to say that if we put the same time and energy into a transpor-

tation bill as we have to this Canadian pet project, we could upgrade our crumbling roads and bridges, expand our mass transit system, provide a huge boost to the American economy, and create jobs in almost every single congressional district in this country, thousands and thousands of permanent jobs in our good country.

We don't need another pipeline dividing our country, polluting our water, pushing us closer and closer to the climate tipping point. A transportation overhaul will actually create jobs that Americans can live off of. Keystone will not, unless what they are considering with these jobs are just the 35 permanent jobs. And maybe they are considering that there will be jobs to create the leaks and the pollution and treat the pollution and illnesses that may be associated with the pollution.

I urge a "no" vote. We should invest in American companies. We should invest in American pipelines. We should invest in American jobs that are here in America for Americans and are permanent.

Again, the State Department estimates that there will be only 35 permanent jobs. So what are we getting? No jobs and pollution from the dirtiest oil source and energy source that is on the Earth at this point.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, would you explain again the amount of time remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Here we are again working to pass a bill to approve construction of the northern portion of the Keystone XL pipeline. Again, with the facts on our side. Again, with bipartisan support in both Houses of Congress. And again, under threat of a veto. But with the new Republican majority in the Senate, the President just might get to make good on his veto threat this time, and we should force him to make that decision.

I urge my colleagues to support this job-creating, North American energy-producing, bipartisan, labor union- and Chamber of Commerce-supported, shovel-ready project. The American people asked for H.R. 3. We have waited long enough.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

□ 1215

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I have heard more than one person say common sense isn't so common anymore. Boy, isn't that right? Well, today, we have a unique opportunity to pass com-

monsense legislation that will truly help the American people and strengthen America.

I am proud to cosponsor H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. It is projected this pipeline will create more than 40,000 good-paying jobs, and it will create far more good jobs indirectly by increasing our energy supply.

At a time when our families are struggling to make ends meet, it is irresponsible for the President to walk away from doing what is right for America. Building the pipeline will help us achieve energy independence. This is an opportunity to strengthen our position in the world, eliminate a key revenue source for our enemies, and strengthen our economy by lowering fuel prices even more.

I urge my colleagues in both Chambers and the President to support the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. This is an opportunity to show the American people that there is still a glimmer of hope for good old common sense.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL).

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, as a combat veteran, we should never have to fight for something that we can so readily produce here. Why should we put competitors in leverage over our economy and give them dollars to use against us?

We hear a lot of talk from progressives on the environment, Mr. Speaker. Imagine a life without petroleum, no cell phones, no asphalt for roads, no synthetic clothing, no plastics. On what do progressives suppose we run our magnificent Nation and lifestyle? Perhaps their answer is sweet bubble love and rainbow stew.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Keystone XL pipeline moves us in exactly the wrong direction: enabling production of the dirtiest crude oil on the planet to expand and increasing our carbon pollution for decades to come.

We still have a lot of work to do to cut our carbon pollution and avoid catastrophic carbon change. The concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere just hit 400 parts per million for the first time in human history.

Although this administration is making great progress, we are far from achieving our pollution reduction goals, and the need to act is more urgent than ever. I would urge my colleagues to vote "no." The President is going to veto this legislation. It is just a political exercise at this point.

Again, it bothers me that I hear so much from the other side about trying to help this Canadian company. We should be concerned about the United States. We should be concerned about the world and the environment that results from climate change and the continued production of greenhouse gases. My concern and the concern of the President is that this is simply not legislation that has been proven to be, so

far, in the national interest. The President is just asking for more time to make that determination.

Vote “no,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to address a couple of things.

First of all, I will place in the RECORD letters I received from the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Council and Caterpillar.

JANUARY 7, 2015.

Hon. KEVIN CRAMER,
Longworth Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CRAMER: The Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council (SBE Council) and our nationwide membership of business owners and entrepreneurs strongly support H.R. 3, the “Keystone XL Pipeline Act.”

Delays in approving this important project cannot be justified on any grounds. This is a critical energy supply and security issue, as well as being vital for U.S. economic growth, job creation and small business development.

This project means quality job growth, new business formation, and an increase in oil supplies from reliable sources. The building and operation of Keystone XL would benefit small businesses via affordable energy and economic growth. Small businesses within the energy sector would see growth opportunities as a result of the pipeline’s construction and operation. An underreported fact is that the U.S. energy sector is dominated by small businesses.

Consider the latest U.S. Census Bureau data:

Among oil and gas extraction businesses, 91.1 percent of employer firms in 2011 had less than 20 workers.

Among oil and gas pipeline and related structures construction businesses, 65.5 percent of employer firms in 2011 had less than 20 workers.

And among oil and gas field machinery and equipment manufacturing businesses, 57.6 percent of employer firms in 2011 had less than 20 workers.

Among support for oil and gas operations businesses, 83.3 percent of employer firms in 2011 had less than 20 workers.

Among drilling oil and gas wells businesses, 79.8 percent of employer firms in 2011 had less than 20 workers.

The energy business is all about small business. A new study released by SBE Council on November 13, 2014, found that small businesses are driving America’s energy renaissance. For example, from 2005–2012, construction businesses related to oil and gas pipeline and related structures grew by 12.2 percent among firms with less than 20 workers; oil and gas extraction businesses grew by 4.1 percent among firms with less than 20 workers; businesses drilling oil and gas wells grew by 7.9 percent among firms with less than 20 workers; businesses supporting oil and gas operations grew by 29.1 percent among firms with less than 20 workers; and manufacturing businesses related to oil and gas field machinery and equipment grew by 8.5 percent among firms with less than 20 workers. It is important to understand that

during this same period, the total number of small and mid-size employer firms declined, but the opposite was true in the energy sector. Construction of Keystone XL would mean increased small business growth, opportunities for entrepreneurs, and a stronger economy for America.

A vote in favor of H.R. 3 is a vote for small business and quality job creation. Thank you for considering America’s small business sector on this critical issue. SBE Council and its members look forward to House passage of H.R. 3.

Sincerely,

KAREN KERRIGAN,
President & CEO.

JANUARY 8, 2015.

Hon. KEVIN CRAMER,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRAMER: On behalf of Caterpillar Inc., I write today in support of H.R. 3 the “Keystone XL Pipeline Act”, which would authorize construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. Caterpillar has long supported the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline because of its significant economic and energy security benefits to North America.

As the world’s leading manufacturer of construction and mining equipment, diesel and natural gas engines, industrial gas turbines, and locomotives; along with our commitment to providing leading financial, remanufacturing, logistics and rail services, Caterpillar has been making sustainable progress possible on every continent for more than 80 years.

With energy related products and services accounting for over one-fourth of our business, Caterpillar, our dealers, and our customers are uniquely positioned to provide solutions to the world’s energy challenges. Through our core business and through new innovative technologies, Caterpillar is one of the world’s leading technology suppliers to the diverse energy market and leverages its technology and innovation to meet the world’s growing energy needs.

In the United States, the approval and construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline would result in billions of dollars of investment, create tens of thousands of jobs, and would allow for the movement of hundreds of thousands of barrels of oil per day. Pipelines are a safe, reliable, economical, and environmentally favorable way to transport oil and petroleum products, as well as other energy liquids throughout the U.S. America already depends on thousands of miles of liquid pipelines to move the energy and raw materials our country relies on for everything from heating homes to powering manufacturing facilities. This additional pipeline capacity will help consumers and business throughout the United States and increase American competitiveness.

Caterpillar commends you for your leadership on this critical issue and looks forward to working with you on the approval of this important project.

Sincerely,

KATHRYN D. KAROL,
Vice President.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to address the climate change issue because I think it is an important issue to a lot of people.

The argument that the other side makes is based on the false idea that somehow oil sands are not going to be developed without the United States. It is. Moving anything by rail is 1.9 times more the emissions of CO₂ than moving it by pipeline. Moving it by truck cre-

ates 2.8 times the CO₂ emissions as moving it by pipeline. Moving it by barge to China is priceless.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In conclusion, I would like to point out a couple of things. First of all, this was a significant issue in the last election just a couple of months ago. This is a piece of legislation about the American people, not a Canadian oil company. In polls, 72 percent of the American people say they support this legislation.

This is about jobs for people in America who need jobs. This is about increasing the energy infrastructure of our country. This is also a project that would not include one dime from the Federal Government. It is going to be at a cost of approximately \$7 billion of private funds that will create a lot of jobs and make us less dependent on foreign oil.

The application for the Keystone pipeline was filed in September of 2008. There are 2.6 million miles of pipelines in America. Most of those pipelines do not have to be approved by the President of the United States, but in this particular pipeline, since it crosses into the country from Canada to the U.S., the President must approve it.

The President has said that one reason he is not going to approve it is because of litigation in Nebraska, which ended today in favor of the Governor of Nebraska who supports this pipeline.

The second ostensible reason for the President to oppose it is CO₂ emissions; yet the Secretary of State’s office under Hillary Clinton and Mr. Kerry in their final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement have said on three occasions that it will have minimal impact on the environment.

Today, we want to pass this legislation once again for the American people. The U.S. Senate said that they will pass it, and we would ask the President to join us and sign this legislation.

I would urge the passage of H.R. 3, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, the majority has chosen the first week of the 114th Congress to relitigate the battles of the previous two Congresses. This time, we’re here debating whether or not to approve a pipeline, through our nation’s Heartland, carrying Canadian tar sand oil.

There are many reasons why I’m opposed to this legislation, Mr. Speaker, the fact that oil produced from tar sands creates 17% more carbon emissions than other crudes; the potentially devastating impact wrought by this heavy crude should a pipeline rupture occur; or that my constituents are enjoying the best prices at the pump in several years without the completion of this pipeline due to the record glut in global oil supply.

Without even getting into the disappointing number of permanent jobs created by this project, which is 50, Mr. Speaker; the President has already clearly stated that he will veto this measure should it ever make it to his desk.

So at the end of the day Mr. Speaker, what are we really talking about here?

It would seem to me that instead of trying to score political points and refighting old battles, the 114th Congress should be using its first week to bring legislation to the floor that fosters an environment of innovation, energy diversification and an investment in clean, domestic forms of renewable energy. Policies that would create hundreds of thousands of new, permanent jobs while also ensuring energy independence for years to come.

While I understand that some of my Democratic Colleagues are in favor, I would strongly urge a "no" vote on this misguided legislation.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. For far too long, President Obama has impeded construction of the Keystone XL pipeline—costing the American people thousands of good-paying jobs and blocking an affordable source of energy. In the face of his continued obstruction, I proudly joined a strong bipartisan group of my colleagues voting to put an end to Obama's obstruction and approving the Keystone XL pipeline.

This legislation is not only good for America, but it is also uniquely important to the 36th District of Texas. The pipeline will bring an economic boost to our area through its construction and new energy supply. For six years President Obama has put politics above what is good for the American people and our local and national economy. This is an important step in putting more Americans back to work, creating opportunity to good jobs and growing our national economy.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge passage of The Keystone XL Pipeline Act.

The Keystone Pipeline represents a critical asset in our efforts to increase energy security and reduce our dependence on Mid-East oil. It would also further lower prices at the pump for American families.

Most importantly, the Pipeline would create thousands of jobs in Texas and across the United States.

The President has threatened to veto this legislation and ignore the will of the American people. Six years of stalling is enough.

The Administration should stop standing in the way of a stronger energy future and thousands of new American jobs. Keystone must be approved immediately.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. While I welcome an open and transparent debate about whether building this pipeline is in our national interest, that is not what this legislation is about. Instead, we are being asked to circumvent the administration's permitting process and pass legislation that has been rushed to the House floor, without consideration by any committee or proceeding through regular order. This is no way to legislate.

The people of Michigan sent me to Congress to fight for our shared values. And no one knows better than the people of my state the importance of protecting our natural resources. This legislation puts those resources at risk by exempting the operators of the pipeline from paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, which helps the federal government respond to oil spills. It also waives all the requirements of the Endangered Species Act

and the National Environmental Policy Act, both of which contain critical environmental protections that cannot be ignored. I simply cannot support legislation which sets these landmark laws aside.

Congress needs to have a real and thoughtful debate on how we promote clean energy in the United States. I am ready to have that debate, but until then, I cannot support flawed legislation that puts our natural resources at risk.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 3.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 19, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Garamendi moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 3. REQUIREMENT THAT TRANSCANADA KEYSTONE PIPELINE, L.P. PAY FOR ANY OIL SPILL CLEANUP ON AMERICAN SOIL.

In the approval process authorized under this Act, TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. shall certify to the President that diluted bitumen and other materials derived from tar sands or oil sands that are transported through the Keystone XL pipeline will be treated as crude oil for the purposes of determining contributions that fund the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer an amendment to this bill. Passage of this amendment will not prevent the passage of the underlying bill. If it is adopted, my amendment will simply be incorporated into the bill, and the bill will immediately be voted upon.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if a question is appropriate, but is this February 2? Is this Groundhog Day? I am curious. This is the 10th time this bill has been before the House, and those who are in support would argue, "Enough is enough. Let's pass it and get on with it."

Those of us in opposition would say, "Well, why haven't you written a bill

that is sufficient to the problems raised by the pipeline?"

Specifically, 10 times on this floor—and even additional times in committee—the issue of the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund has been raised. We have raised that issue 10 times. It has been debated here on the floor. I have heard five, six people speak to that issue.

The chairmen of the committee are well aware that this bill has a huge loophole in it allowing one company that owns a pipeline to avoid paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

Why in the world would we move a bill that allows this company, unique among all others, to not participate in a very, very important part of the protection of communities and the environment?

The Kalamazoo issue has been raised here—the spill. Over \$60 million was paid for by the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and then reimbursed by the pipeline company.

Let's do something right. This is great fun: back and forth, back and forth. We kick this thing around. We may get some political points on one side or the other. But why in the world don't we write a decent piece of legislation? Why don't we do it right? Why would we exempt one company among all of the others of hundreds of pipeline companies and allow this one Canadian company—and I love Canada, my son-in-law is a Canadian.

This is about doing what is right. This amendment would simply include this company being required to participate in the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. It is a lot of dollars. It is about \$24 million a year. That is a pretty good tax break. Who among us would not like to have that tax break? I guess we are all going to stand up because we want to have it.

The rest of the story is this: we have spent an enormous amount of time on this issue when, in fact, as has been said here many times by proponents and opponents, we ought to get on to real infrastructure.

Consider the time spent on this issue when you consider the time that has been spent on transportation bills on this floor. Consider the time that we must spend figuring out how to pay for repairing our bridges, building our highways, our ports, our airports. Consider that time.

Ten times, this bill has been here. Ten times, this House has ignored a tax break that is not warranted. It will allow to move forward to the Senate a bill that, in its very substance, provides an unwarranted, unnecessary, and grossly unequal tax break to one company among all the other pipeline companies.

This amendment simply comes to the point of making sure that this pipeline

company, like every other petroleum pipeline company in America, pays its fair share of the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, which is essential.

I see some of my friends from Michigan here. You know how important this is. The Kalamazoo River was a big deal—\$60 million thus far and more to come. The Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund was there to provide the early money for the cleanup.

It is important, folks. My colleagues, this is important. Let's do it right. This is our 10th time. Let's do it right. Adopt this amendment. We clear up one problem in the bill. We remove one point of opposition, and we do what is right.

I ask for your "aye" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order and seek time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the motion to recommit, and I would just say to all my colleagues: our side certainly views that as a procedural issue, not as a real amendment.

I would say that in the markup that we had on this bill in earlier years, I pledged to work with Mrs. CAPPS on our committee to find a solution that would be fair to the bill.

I support the concept of what the gentleman is doing, and in fact, I sent a letter in 2012 to the then-chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Dave Camp, asking for help on this, and we were hoping that we would see comprehensive tax reform, and this would have been included as part of that.

□ 1230

But that did not happen. We didn't get tax reform.

So as this bill comes forward, a review does have to be made in terms of how to treat crude oil derived from oil sands for the purposes of the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. But I have to say that really is a Ways and Means issue, now a Transportation issue, not an Energy and Commerce issue.

I know that this issue is going to be raised in the Senate with an amendment probably in the next week. I would just say to the gentleman and those that support this idea, I look forward to working with our Senate colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, as well as Republicans and Democrats in this body to, in fact, address this situation that does need to happen.

But as a motion to recommit, we shouldn't do it now. So let my Democrat friends vote "yes." I would urge my Republicans on this side to vote "no." I just want to give them the assurance that, in fact, as this bill moves into the conference, as what I expect to happen, that I certainly intend to see an understanding go forward.

Mr. SHUSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the Transportation Committee.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman.

I am in agreement with the chairman of Energy and Commerce. This is, again, something to be dealt with on a tax bill.

Two things that are good have happened today. One, the Nebraska Supreme Court has removed the final hurdle to move this bill forward; and number two, my good friend from California and I agreed today on something—that this thing should be dealt with. But this is not the place or the time to deal with it.

Moving forward, we want to make sure that this is dealt with in the proper way, and I believe that the Ways and Means Committee will do that.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you so very much.

I have enormous respect for the two of you, and this issue has been before us many, many times. If we wait for a comprehensive tax reform, the tar sands may be totally eliminated and used up. We have an opportunity today to get it done.

Mr. UPTON. Reclaiming my time, we understand that this will not be part of a comprehensive tax reform bill. We need to act earlier than that.

With the Senate now passing a bill, in all likelihood next week, likely with an amendment addressing this situation, we can deal with it as part of that conference report, and I look forward to supporting that and the inclusion of such in the final package.

I would again urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the procedural motion to recommit so that we can get to final passage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 180, nays 237, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—180

Adams	Ashford	Beatty
Aguilar	Bass	Becerra

Bera	Grayson	Nolan
Beyer	Green, Al	Norcross
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Pallone
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Pascarell
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	Payne
Boyle (PA)	Hahn	Pelosi
Brady (PA)	Hastings	Perlmutter
Brown (FL)	Heck (WA)	Peters
Brownley (CA)	Higgins	Peterson
Bustos	Himes	Pingree
Butterfield	Honda	Pocan
Capps	Hoyer	Polis
Capuano	Huffman	Price (NC)
Carney	Israel	Quigley
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Cartwright	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Chu (CA)	Kaptur	Ruiz
Cicilline	Keating	Ruppersberger
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Clay	Kildee	Sánchez, Linda
Cleaver	Kilmer	T.
Clyburn	Kind	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Connolly	Kuster	Schiff
Conyers	Langevin	Schrader
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Costa	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Courtney	Lawrence	Serrano
Crowley	Lee	Sewell (AL)
Cuellar	Levin	Sherman
Cummings	Lewis	Sinema
Davis (CA)	Lieu (CA)	Sires
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Slaughter
DeFazio	Loeback	Smith (WA)
DeGette	Lofgren	Speier
Delaney	Lowenthal	Swaiwell (CA)
DeLauro	Lowey	Takai
DeBene	Lujan Grisham	Takano
DeSaulnier	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
Deutch	Luján, Ben Ray	Titus
Dingell	(NM)	Tonko
Doggett	Lynch	Torres
Doyle (PA)	Maloney,	Tsongas
Edwards	Carolyn	Van Hollen
Ellison	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Engel	Matsui	Veasey
Eshoo	McCollum	Vela
Esty	McDermott	Velázquez
Farr	McGovern	Visclosky
Fattah	McNerney	Walz
Foster	Meeks	Wasserman
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Schultz
Fudge	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Gallego	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Graham	Neal	

NAYS—237

Abraham	Comstock	Graves (GA)
Aderholt	Conaway	Graves (LA)
Allen	Cook	Graves (MO)
Amash	Costello (PA)	Griffith
Amodei	Cramer	Grothman
Babin	Crawford	Guinta
Barletta	Crenshaw	Guthrie
Barr	Culberson	Hanna
Barton	Curbelo (FL)	Hardy
Benishek	Davis, Rodney	Harper
Bilirakis	Denham	Harris
Bishop (MI)	Dent	Hartzler
Bishop (UT)	DeSantis	Heck (NV)
Black	DesJarlais	Hensarling
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart	Herrera Beutler
Blum	Dold	Hice (GA)
Bost	Duffy	Hill
Boustany	Duncan (SC)	Holding
Brady (TX)	Ellmers	Hudson
Brat	Emmer	Huelskamp
Bridenstine	Farenthold	Huizenga (MI)
Brooks (AL)	Fitzpatrick	Hultgren
Brooks (IN)	Fleischmann	Hunter
Buchanan	Fleming	Hurd (TX)
Buck	Flores	Hurt (VA)
Bucshon	Forbes	Issa
Burgess	Fortenberry	Jenkins (KS)
Byrne	Fox	Jenkins (WV)
Calvert	Franks (AZ)	Johnson (OH)
Carter (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Johnson, Sam
Chabot	Garrett	Jolly
Chaffetz	Gibbs	Jones
Clawson (FL)	Gibson	Jordan
Coffman	Gohmert	Joyce
Cole	Goodlatte	Katko
Collins (GA)	Gowdy	Kelly (PA)
Collins (NY)	Granger	King (IA)

King (NY) Olson
 Kinzinger (IL) Palazzo
 Kline Palmer
 Knight Paulsen
 Labrador Perry
 LaMalfa Pittenger
 Lamborn Pitts
 Lance Poe (TX)
 Latta Poliquin
 LoBiondo Pompeo
 Long Posey
 Loudermilk Price (GA)
 Love Ratcliffe
 Lucas Reed
 Luetkemeyer Reichert
 Lummis Renacci
 MacArthur Ribble
 Marchant Rice (SC)
 Marino Rigell
 Massie Roby
 McCarthy Roe (TN)
 McCaul Rogers (AL)
 McClintock Rogers (KY)
 McHenry Rohrabacher
 McKinley Rokita
 McSally Rooney (FL)
 Meadows Ros-Lehtinen
 Meehan Roskam
 Messer Ross
 Mica Rothfus
 Miller (FL) Rouzer
 Miller (MI) Royce
 Moolenaar Russell
 Mooney (WV) Ryan (WI)
 Mullin Salmon
 Mulvaney Sanford
 Murphy (PA) Scalise
 Neugebauer Schock
 Newhouse Schweikert
 Noem Scott, Austin
 Nugent Sensenbrenner
 Nunes Sessions

NOT VOTING—12

Cárdenas Hinojosa
 Duckworth McMorris
 Duncan (TN) Rodgers
 Fincher Moore
 Gosar O'Rourke

□ 1256

Mrs. ELLMERS, Messrs. BYRNE, HANNA, and STEWART changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. ASHFORD, Ms. DELBENE, Messrs. PAYNE, NEAL, Ms. CASTOR of Florida and KAPTUR changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF TERRORIST ATTACKS IN FRANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in memory of the victims of the terrorist attacks in France.

Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 266, nays 153, answered “present” 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]
 YEAS—266
 Abraham Grothman
 Aderholt Guinta
 Allen Guthrie
 Amodei Hanna
 Ashford Hardy
 Babin Harper
 Barletta Harris
 Barr Hartzler
 Barton Heck (NV)
 Benishek Hensarling
 Bilirakis Herrera Beutler
 Bishop (GA) Hice (GA)
 Bishop (MI) Hill
 Bishop (UT) Holding
 Black Hudson
 Blackburn Huelskamp
 Blum Huizenga (MI)
 Bost Hultgren
 Boustany Hunter
 Brady (PA) Hurd (TX)
 Brady (TX) Hurt (VA)
 Brat Issa
 Bridenstine Jackson Lee
 Brooks (AL) Jenkins (KS)
 Brooks (IN) Jenkins (WV)
 Buchanan Johnson (OH)
 Buck Johnson, Sam
 Bucshon Jolly
 Burgess Jones
 Bustos Jordan
 Byrne Joyce
 Calvert Katko
 Carter (GA) Kelly (PA)
 Chabot King (IA)
 Chaffetz King (NY)
 Clawson (FL) Kinzinger (IL)
 Clyburn Kline
 Coffman Knight
 Cole Labrador
 Collins (GA) LaMalfa
 Collins (NY) Lamborn
 Comstock Lance
 Conaway Latta
 Cook Lipinski
 Cooper LoBiondo
 Costa Loebsack
 Costello (PA) Long
 Cramer Loudermilk
 Crawford Love
 Crenshaw Lucas
 Cuellar Luetkemeyer
 Culberson Lummis
 Curbelo (FL) MacArthur
 Davis, Rodney Maloney, Sean
 Denham Marchant
 Dent Marino
 DeSantis Massie
 DesJarlais McCarthy
 Diaz-Balart McCaul
 Dold McClintock
 Doyle (PA) McHenry
 Duffy McKinley
 Duncan (SC) McMorris
 Ellmers Rodgers
 Emmer McSally
 Farenthold Meadows
 Fitzpatrick Meehan
 Fleischmann Messer
 Fleming Mica
 Flores Miller (FL)
 Forbes Miller (MI)
 Fortenberry Moolenaar
 Foxx Mooney (WV)
 Franks (AZ) Mullin
 Frelinghuysen Mulvaney
 Garrett Murphy (FL)
 Gibbs Murphy (PA)
 Gibson Neugebauer
 Gohmert Newhouse
 Goodlatte Noem
 Gowdy Nolan
 Graham Norcross
 Granger Nugent
 Graves (GA) Nunes
 Graves (LA) Olson
 Graves (MO) Palazzo
 Green, Al Green, Gene
 Griffith Palmer
 Paulsen
 Pearce

NAYS—153

Adams Bera
 Aguilar Beyer
 Bass Blumenauer
 Beatty Bonamici
 Becerra Boyle (PA)

Cárdenas Higgins
 Carney Himes
 Carson (IN) Honda
 Cartwright Hoyer
 Castor (FL) Huffman
 Castro (TX) Israel
 Chu (CA) Jeffries
 Cicilline Johnson (GA)
 Clark (MA) Johnson, E. B.
 Clarke (NY) Kaptur
 Clay Keating
 Cleaver Kelly (IL)
 Cohen Kennedy
 Connolly Kildee
 Conyers Kilmer
 Courtney Kind
 Crowley Kirkpatrick
 Cummings Kuster
 Davis (CA) Langevin
 Davis, Danny Larsen (WA)
 DeFazio Larson (CT)
 DeGette Lawrence
 Delaney Lee
 DeLauro Levin
 DelBene Lewis
 DeSaulnier Lieu (CA)
 Deutch Lofgren
 Dingell Lowenthal
 Doggett Lowey
 Edwards Lujan Grisham
 Ellison (NM)
 Engel Luján, Ben Ray
 Eshoo (NM)
 Esty Lynch
 Farr Maloney,
 Fattah Carolyn
 Foster Matsui
 Frankel (FL) McCollum
 Fudge McDermott
 Gabbard McGovern
 Gallego McNeerney
 Garamendi Meeks
 Grayson Meng
 Grijalva Moulton
 Gutiérrez Nadler
 Hahn Napolitano
 Hastings Neal
 Heck (WA) Pallone

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—9

Duckworth Gosar
 Duncan (TN) Hinojosa
 Fincher Moore
 O'Rourke
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Thompson (MS)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1305

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, myself and other members of the New York delegation were not able to be here on swearing-in day because we were attending the funeral of former Governor Mario Cuomo in New York, and we were also not here to cast a vote for Speaker of the House.

Had I been present during that vote, I would have cast my ballot for the right Honorable NANCY PELOSI of California, and I would like the RECORD to reflect my vote for Ms. PELOSI.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I was with Mr. CROWLEY attending the funeral on Monday of former Governor Mario

Cuomo, and therefore I was not able to be here.

Had I been here, I would have cast my vote for Speaker for the Honorable NANCY PELOSI from California, and I want the RECORD to reflect the same.

□ 1315

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come. So at this point, I am pleased to yield to my friend from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Wednesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected around noon. On Thursday and Friday, no votes are expected.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business today.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 186, the Regulatory Accountability Act, authored by Chairman GOODLATTE. This bipartisan bill will modernize the regulatory process, ensure transparency, and reduce overly burdensome costs that are hurting job creators across the country.

The House will also consider H.R. 37, the Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act, authored by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative FITZPATRICK, which includes bipartisan reforms to reduce red tape and ensure that small businesses have access to the capital they need to grow.

Finally, the House is expected to consider legislation to fund the Department of Homeland Security and respond to the President's unconstitutional executive action.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the information he has given us.

First, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the majority leader for bringing to the floor in a timely fashion the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, which we passed overwhelmingly in a bipartisan fashion. I think that it was very, very important that we got that through the House early. As the majority leader knows, the Senate has already passed that bill, and it is on its way to the President. That, obviously, will raise the confidence level of those who are going to create jobs and enter into construction projects. It is very important for our economy and for our communities. So I thank the majority leader for his quick action and leadership on that issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful the majority leader can inform us of what form the Department of Homeland Security appropriation bill will come to the floor. And what I mean by "what form," the committee bill, obviously, will be supported almost unanimously on both sides—certainly on this side of the aisle unanimously—if, in fact, it is the funding levels that resulted from the agreement between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party and passed overwhelmingly, known as the Ryan-Murray budget numbers.

The committee marked up its bill, reported it out. It was included in the omnibus. But it was included, as the gentleman knows, only until February 27.

Can the gentleman tell me whether that will come to the floor as reported out of committee? And when I say "committee," I mean the House Appropriations Committee. Or when reported out, will it be considered under a rule? And if considered under a rule, will that rule allow amendments?

And I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The base bill will reflect the Appropriations Committee's bipartisan, bicameral negotiations on funding for the Department of Homeland Security, the text of which will be available later today. And to answer the question, yes, the funding level will be at that.

We also will consider a series of amendments which respond to the President's executive action, and I expect the text of those will be available a little later today.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I am pretty sure I understand exactly what the gentleman said. Therefore, those amendments will be offered on the floor and will not be incorporated in the base bill?

Mr. MCCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

When will the hearing on the rule be held so that our Members can know; so that if they have amendments they would like to offer, they can appear at the Rules Committee?

And I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I anticipate the Rules Committee meeting on Monday.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that, and I will make sure that our Members know that.

Mr. Speaker, I know the Speaker just held a moment of silence—and I will be saying something in a few minutes—on the tragic events that have happened in France, the loss of life in the initial incident, in the hostage-taking, and of the law enforcement officer. Clearly this was in France, but we know that we are all vulnerable in all of the free world.

I would urge the majority leader to ensure that the Homeland Security bill passes this House in a bipartisan fashion. And what I mean by that is, I know there are going to be amend-

ments offered. I know his side of the aisle is very concerned and believes—and he has asserted—that the actions taken by the President were unconstitutional. We do not share that view, as the gentleman knows, that they were unconstitutional. We believe the executive was within his authority and prosecutorial discretion on the executive side of the government. But we also know that that issue is going to be an issue of substantial debate, discussion, and I am sure other legislative actions.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the majority leader to—I think it is in the best interest making sure the Homeland Security bill is passed so there is no doubt as to the resources that the Homeland Security Department will have to protect all Americans, to protect our homeland, and to coordinate extensively.

Secretary Johnson has made statements this week that the failure to have full funding for the Department of Homeland Security has already impeded his ability and the Department's ability to act fully on behalf of the security of this country.

So, Mr. Majority Leader, I know that all 435 of us are committed to making sure that we do everything we can to keep our homeland safe and our people safe. And I would hope that we would have nothing included in the bill which would be very controversial, reflecting our differences, when the underlying bill, I think, is not controversial, when the underlying bill is something on which we can almost unanimously, I think, agree and is something that ought to be passed and ought to be signed by the President and ought to give the Department of Homeland Security the full resources it needs to keep America safe.

And I would be glad to yield to my friend, the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, currently, the Department of Homeland Security is funded up until February 27. But as was noted, next week is the second week back in. And we are taking this up in the second week because I believe on both sides of the aisle, we care about the homeland, we care about our security, and this is something that has been worked on together. And inside this body, we have a constitutional responsibility to deal with those items that are germane, and we will deal with all the items that are germane.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I look forward to working with him next week to hopefully achieve the passage of a bill that will not prove controversial in the Senate or with the President of the United States so that this can be effective, as the gentleman observed, as quickly as possible. I appreciate him bringing it to the floor, and I also appreciate the fact that the amendments are going to be considered separately. And I would hope that we

could join together in opposing amendments which will undermine the bipartisanship of the legislation.

We have 3-day weeks coming up now. We will have a couple of short weeks when the Republicans go to their retreat, their issues conference, and then when the Democrats go to their issues conference.

I would ask if you could give me a sense of the legislation that will be on for the remainder of the month.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman is correct. We have 3-day weeks for retreats for the House on both sides of the aisle. And this year, the Republicans will be retreating with the Republicans in the Senate as well, leaving next Wednesday.

The House will be very active throughout January, focusing on bipartisan solutions that have been needlessly stuck in the Senate. As the gentleman knows, 382 bills did pass this House but got stuck in the Senate, and more than half of those actually were even passed by voice vote.

This will include a bill to expedite the Federal review process for natural gas pipeline permit applications and a bill to cut through red tape and ensure exports of liquefied natural gas to our allies.

As we get closer to consideration for each week, I assure the gentleman that a full list of bills coming before the House will be available for Members.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

And lastly, Mr. Leader, if I could ask you about the border security bill. It is my understanding that the border bill could be coming to the floor this month. And I know that the gentleman from Texas, Chairman MCCAUL, has said that Republican leaders are getting close—and I am quoting—to having a separate border policy bill ready to go. I know they, referring to the Republican leadership, want Homeland appropriations on the floor next week, as we have already discussed. So what is going to be tied to that is unclear at this point, but we are working on a border bill right now.

Now, as you know, Mr. Leader, the McCaul border bill passed out of committee either on voice vote or unanimously, with both parties agreeing. And, in fact, the Democrats in the last Congress, in the comprehensive immigration bill that we introduced, included dropping the Senate border security bill and putting in the McCaul bill, as the gentleman undoubtedly knows, because we believed that was the better approach.

Can the gentleman tell me, will the McCaul bill, as passed in the last Congress, be the border bill that will be reported? Or does the majority leader know that at this point in time?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In speaking to Chairman MCCAUL, he does want to move a bill, maybe towards later this month. I know he has

a trip to the border with a number of Members. I know he would like to move the bill after that trip. So I anticipate a bill shortly. And as soon as we have a date, I will let the gentleman know.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

And I hope that we can, as we did in the first iteration of the McCaul bill, have a unanimous bipartisan agreement because all of us want to make sure the border is, in fact, secure again, as we want to see that the Homeland Security Department has its full complement of resources to protect the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 2015

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, January 12, 2015, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BABIN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXECUTIVE ORDERS REGARDING IMMIGRATION

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the President's executive orders on immigration, set to take effect in mid-2015.

The Constitution, in article I, section 8, expressly grants the legislature the sole authority to establish rules for naturalization. Yet on November 20, 2014, the President announced new policies that would enable a substantial portion of the unlawfully present alien population to obtain relief from removal and work authorization.

In addition to substantive constitutional separation of power concerns, the action raises national security implications and a range of other potentially harmful consequences.

For this reason, in December, the House passed H.R. 83, which imposes a February 27 funding sunset for the agencies responsible for carrying out the President's orders.

While this limitation creates an opportunity for the new majority in Congress to take action against the President's unilateral actions, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle should want to protect the rule of law, our constitutional separation of powers, and the best interests of hard-working Americans. The American people deserve as much.

WE ARE ALL CHARLIE

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise, as I know all Americans would rise if they were here, to express our solidarity with, our sympathy to, and our convictions for a strong alliance with the people of France.

The despicable and tragic murder in Paris on Tuesday of journalists and those who protected them ought to be a reminder that we cannot and must not take for granted the freedoms we enjoy living in a democracy.

The men and women who were targeted in Paris on Wednesday were cartoonists whose job was to use humor to make people question their leaders and their most cherished principles. Freedom of speech, protected in the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, which was read today on this floor, means nothing if that speech can be intimidated and shuttered by violence.

The principles that we speak of were part of a long tradition in France and in this country of bringing the loftiest of people and ideas down to Earth through the power of satire.

Freedom of the press and free expression of ideas are a necessary check against tyranny and oppression. They are as much a part of democracy as the right to vote and due process in court.

Mr. Speaker, in attacking these journalists, the terrorists made their target clear, and that is freedom itself—freedom in America, freedom in France, freedom throughout the world, freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, and freedom of dissent.

The taking of innocent hostages at a kosher market today further demonstrated the terrorists' utter disregard for the "liberty, equality, and brotherhood" that are the foundation of the French democracy and the American democracy.

The democratic nations of the world must continue to stand up to those who wish to stifle the basic freedoms that all people deserve. I know that all 435 Members of this Congress are united in that conviction. I join with all of my colleagues in offering my condolences to the families of the victims and to the French people.

Mr. Speaker, in that regard, I articulate what has just been demonstrated by all by standing in silence, just as President Kennedy declared, "Ich bin ein Berliner," and newspapers around the world after 9/11 read, "We are all Americans."

Today, all freedom-loving people around the world join together in solidarity to say, "We are all Charlie"—"Nous" sommes tous Charlie."

CHRISTMAS DRONES

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Red Ryder BB gun is a ghost of Christmas past because, this year, Santa

gave drones. Here a drone, there a drone, everywhere a drone. Just more eyes in the sky and these eyes could be anywhere and on any person. How comforting is that?

It is estimated that by 2030, 30,000 drones will be over the skies of America. People are rightfully concerned that these eyes in the sky could be a threat to their constitutional right of privacy.

Mr. Speaker, we are entering a world of unchartered drone technology. That is why I am reintroducing the Preserving American Privacy Act. This bill seeks to ensure the privacy of Americans. It establishes specific guidelines for about when and what purposes that law enforcement and private entities can use drones.

Technology may change, but the Constitution does not. The Christmas spy machines that have useful purposes also need constitutional rules to prevent unlawful surveillance by law enforcement or private organizations.

And that is just the way it is.

A RETURN TO AMERICA'S HIGHEST IDEALS

(Mr. FORTENBERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, this week the Members of the 114th United States Congress took their oaths of office. Families and friends from around the country came to participate in this great American tradition of representative democracy and to support their loved ones. I was pleased that my own wife and five daughters were here with me as well.

The start of a new Congress is always an exciting time to renew our government and the promise of America, but as we all know, we face tremendous challenges. Political dysfunction and partisan gridlock have made smart and effective government very difficult here.

An arthritic economic recovery has dimmed the financial prospects of too many small businesses and their families. In our time of social fracture, more and more people are feeling directionless and alone.

Mr. Speaker, as I often like to say, there is nothing wrong in America that can't be fixed by what is right in America, but this will require bold resolve, innovative public policy, and a return to our highest ideals.

We must restore our economic vibrancy through responsible government, reclaiming our best traditions, and building a culture of life that respects the dignity and rights of all persons.

Let's repurpose Washington. Let's turn our country around.

CUBA

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, the administration's concessions to the tyrannical Cuban regime have only strengthened the iron grip of the dictatorship, and by President Obama attempting to normalize relations with the island, we are only putting more money into the coffers of these thugs to continue their repressive ways.

The White House and the State Department were once again fooled by a tyrant, and that has grave consequences for our credibility around the world.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad deal. It is a bad deal for the people of Cuba, a bad deal for America, and a bad deal for freedom-loving people everywhere.

Today, I was joined by other Members of Congress in sending a letter to Secretary Kerry urging the administration to stop its concessions, abandon the talks scheduled with Cuba later this month, and get serious about bringing true reforms to Cuba first before even contemplating a change in our relations.

If they won't listen, it is up to us in Congress to defend freedom for Cuba and, indeed, around the world.

APPRECIATING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF PAUL CLYMER, PENNSYLVANIA STATE REPRESENTATIVE

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, last fall, after 34 years of distinguished public service, Pennsylvania State representative Paul Clymer from upper Bucks County announced his retirement. Throughout his career, Representative Clymer has been a strong advocate on many issues ranging from education to economic development.

An avid historian, Paul chaired the committee responsible for the renovation on the State capitol building. He took a personal interest in this project, working diligently to ensure the completed renovation would live up to President Theodore Roosevelt's declaration in 1906 when he called it, "the handsomest building he ever saw."

More than a century later, thanks in part to Paul's work, the building still strikes visitors with awe. Although he has many accomplishments to his name, it has been Representative Clymer's gentlemanly demeanor for which he was best known.

Paul was known in government as a man of conviction who would stand up for his principles, yet also able to listen to those who passionately opposed him. He has been a model public servant and a mentor to many, including to me, and I want to say, "Well done, Paul, in your retirement."

AMERICA WELCOMES ALL PEOPLE AND DOES NOT STIGMATIZE BASED ON RELIGION, ETHNICITY, OR RACE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, we started by reading the Constitution, and I did not want to leave this week without reminding us of Amendment One of the Bill of Rights:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

Today, we stand with the people of France who, in the early years of our beginnings, certainly gave to America many of the democratic principles by way of their own values. Today, we acknowledge that violence will not undermine democratic values around the Nation or around the world.

We mourn those who have lost their lives, and we want to stop the terrorist violence, but what we most want to do is to be able to acknowledge the individual dignity of all people and that we will not stigmatize religions or ethnicities or race in this country, but we will recognize that we are great because we are able to welcome all from all places and to be able to accept their human dignity.

We have a Constitution and a Bill of Rights, and I am grateful for the greatness of this Nation, but I stand with the people of France and mourn their loss this week.

LAW ENFORCEMENT APPRECIATION DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time, and I would like to claim this time to spend a few moments on the floor of this House to express the appreciation of myself and my colleagues to those who serve every day in our law enforcement community.

There is no better way to kick off this time than to yield to a colleague of mine from the State of Washington, a former sheriff of 30 years in law enforcement, and a former Sheriff of the Year from King County, my colleague from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding and his kind introduction.

Today, Mr. Speaker, is National Law Enforcement Appreciation Day. I hope this becomes a yearly thing. It is sponsored today by the National Sheriffs'

Association, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the FOP, and other law enforcement organizations—national, State, and local organizations.

As Mr. JOLLY said, I served 33 years in the sheriff's office in Seattle, starting in a patrol car and eventually ending my career as the sheriff. I know from my own personal experience in serving those years that a cop's mission is to protect their community.

I know this from working with law enforcement not only in the sheriff's office in Seattle, but with the Seattle Police Department, all the police departments and sheriffs' offices in the State of Washington and even across this country. I have had the opportunity to work with a number of law enforcement organizations—local, State, and Federal.

Mr. Speaker, they come each day with the heart of a servant. They come each day knowing that, when they put on that badge and that uniform, that they may not go home. They know that, but they do it anyway.

Why do they do that? Why do they take that risk? Why did I take that risk for 33 years? Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, I did come close several times in my career to losing my life to protect the community I served.

Let me also say that I lost some dear friends over those 33 years. One was my best friend, Sam Hicks, who was shot and killed in June of 1982. Another good friend in 1984 was stabbed to death.

It is a dangerous job, but it is a job they choose to do because they choose to serve the community. They choose to put their life on the line to protect and serve all of us, protect our families, our children, our businesses, and our property each and every day.

□ 1345

But no one is perfect, we know that. There are good police officers and there are bad police officers. There are good mechanics and there are bad mechanics. There are good lawyers and there are bad lawyers. We all come from the human race. There is good and bad in all of us. So no police department is perfect, and no police officer is perfect, and sometimes things go wrong. They are required to make split decisions, life-and-death decisions. In a moment's notice, you can have a gun pointed at you, and you have to make that decision: Do I shoot or not? Can I talk that person out of that gun? I have been in that position, too. Fortunately, I was able to talk that person out of his gun and took him to jail.

But sometimes things go wrong, and when it does, police, rightly so, must be under the microscope. There must be public scrutiny. Cops know that. Police chiefs know that. Sheriffs know it, and we accept that, too. But when things go wrong and we watch these incidents and these events unfold over the media, let us all remember that police officers have constitutional rights,

too. They are allowed due process, too. They are American citizens, too. They have constitutional rights and protections also.

The Constitution, as was mentioned earlier, was read today, reminding us that we all have those constitutional rights. You are innocent until proven guilty. So when something happens that we think is wrong, let's pay attention to the facts. Let's let the process go forward; and then based on the facts—based on the facts—let's work with the community, with the police department and the mayor and city council and change the policy, change the procedures, and make sure that it doesn't happen again.

But today, let us also remember the service of the men and women, the brave and dedicated men and women who put that uniform on every day. I am going to name a few police officers from Washington State who, 5 years ago—and this is the 5-year anniversary of the death of these police officers, gunned down, four of them gunned down while sitting in a coffee shop in Lakewood, Washington—paid that ultimate sacrifice, that ultimate price that we often hear talked about: Sergeant Mark Renninger, Officer Ronald Owens, Officer Tina Griswold, Officer Greg Richards, as well as Seattle Police Officer Timothy Brenton and Pierce County Deputy Kent Mundell, all from Washington State, all not with us today, all of their families missing them.

During these difficult times, Mr. Speaker, we need to come together as a community, as a country, as a nation, and recognize the service of these police officers across the country. I will end with the simple act that comes so easily for us with people who serve in the military, just a simple "thank you." If you see a police officer today as you go about your duties, your day's duties, please walk up and say "thank you." Please tell them you appreciate their service. That means the world to them.

Mr. JOLLY. I thank my colleague from the State of Washington.

Today, on Law Enforcement Appreciation Day, I would like to yield to a champion supporter of law enforcement, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for scheduling this Special Order to honor the men and women who put their lives on the line every day, as we just heard from our colleague from Washington.

Last year in the United States of America, 119 law enforcement officers lost their lives in the line of duty; 119 lives snuffed out. It was not because they did anything wrong, but they were performing their duty to protect you and me so that every night when we go to sleep, we put our heads on our pillows and sleep soundly.

We take it for granted. There is something about it that we think is just natural. There is nothing natural

about someone who goes out every day and consciously gives of themselves and puts their life on the line for someone else. Jesus said there is no greater love than this, than someone who would lay down his life for his brother. And law enforcement officers do that every day.

Yet sometimes when we get these incidents in America, we somehow forget that. We forget that they have husbands and wives and children and parents and sisters and brothers and friends, that they are people, too. They are citizens in our community, just like we are, and they go out every day to protect you and me and give us a quality of life that, as I say, we take for granted. So it is altogether fitting that we would take today and recognize them, salute them, recognize them, honor them, thank them for what they do for all of us.

I hope that we won't just do it for today. I hope we do it 365 days a year, because they are here for us 365 days a year.

So on behalf of my constituents in the First Congressional District of Alabama, I say to law enforcement officials in my district and throughout America: We thank you. We salute you. God bless you.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as well to say thank you to law enforcement officers throughout Pinellas County, Florida, and across the Nation. Thank you for your service and thank you for your sacrifice. And I thank your families.

Each day in Pinellas County, Florida, the community I have the opportunity to represent, as well as across the country, thousands of law enforcement officers serve and protect us, often at great sacrifice to their families and at risk to their very own lives.

This was the case on December 21 when Officer Charles Kondek of the Tarpon Springs Police Department in Pinellas County responded to simple a noise complaint. It would be Officer Kondek's end of watch as he tragically lost his life at the hands of a gunman, a gunman whose actions represent the type of inhumanity that we entrust our law enforcement officers each day to protect us from. Officer Kondek was only 45 years old, and he is survived by, and his memory lives on through, his wife and his six children.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, this story repeats itself throughout communities across the country. The Nation witnessed, on December 20, in New York, two law enforcement officers who were assassinated by an individual with one intention: to take the lives specifically of law enforcement officers.

Mr. Speaker, in my hometown of Pinellas County, the brotherhood of law enforcement officers, the sisterhood of law enforcement officers who protect us each day understands, just like law enforcement officers across the country, the very risk to their safety and to their lives and the risk and

the heartbreak of their families and their children, that that risk is very real.

In our county, we have lost a total of 24 officers, including, in recent years, St. Petersburg officers David Crawford, Jeffrey Yaslowitz, and Thomas Baitinger, each representing a precious loss of life while serving and protecting us.

And yet we find ourselves today listening to some, a minority in our society, who wish to give voice to those who undermine the very honor of law enforcement officers, who undermine the very sacrifice of our law enforcement officers, and who undermine the very danger that these law enforcement officers face each day. Instead, we should be rising to say "thank you" to the men and women of law enforcement, "thank you" to the men and women in our communities who protect and defend us.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to do just that, to say "thank you." Thank you to Officer Kondek of Tarpon Springs for his service, and thank you to his family for sharing him with a community that will forever remember his ultimate sacrifice. Thank you to the families of all fallen law enforcement officers, and thank you to those who continue to serve each day.

I want to thank our local law enforcement leadership in my hometown of Pinellas County: Pinellas County Sheriff Bob Gualtieri, Clearwater Police Chief Dan Slaughter, St. Petersburg Police Chief Anthony Holloway, Chief Terry Hughes of my hometown of Indian Shores, Belleair Police Chief Bill Sohl, Gulfport Police Chief Robert Vincent, Kenneth City Police Chief Kevin Matson, Largo Police Chief Jeffrey Undestad, Pinellas Park Police Chief Dorene Thomas, Pinellas County Schools Police Chief Rick Stelljes, Tarpon Springs Police Chief Robert Kochen, Treasure Island Police Chief Tim Casey, and Chief David Hendry of the University of South Florida, St. Petersburg.

I especially want to thank all members of law enforcement in my hometown and those throughout Pinellas County who get in their cars each day and walk the streets, respond to crime, investigate crimes and respond to disturbances and ultimately protect us. I want to thank those I am privileged, within the law enforcement community, to call friends, officers from the Clearwater police force: my dear friend Detective Jonathan Walser, Detective Michael Stonelake, Detective Christopher Precious, Sergeant John Brown, Officer Bill Renfro, Lieutenant Juan Torres, and Lieutenant Richard Harris. And from the Pinellas County Sheriff's Department, my friend, Sergeant Steve Wagner.

Thank you to each of you.

And I want to thank the Capitol Police officers who protect each of us here as Members of Congress and the thousands of Capitol visitors each year that are protected from threats that at

times can be tragically real. Thank you to all who serve, from Pinellas County, throughout the State of Florida, communities across the country, and right here in this very Chamber. Thank you for protecting us. Thank you for serving. Thank you to every law enforcement officer for your commitment to duty, your service to your community, and your service to your fellow man.

As my colleague, BRADLEY BYRNE said, blessed are those who would lay down their life for their brethren. That is the oath—to risk their life to protect others—that our law enforcement officers renew each day.

Indeed, may our loving God richly bless each one of you who put on the uniform of law enforcement, and may God richly bless your families. May God's loving hands protect and defend each of you every day of your service, just as you protect and defend each one of us. Please know that this Member of Congress and millions of people across the country, including those in Pinellas County and Florida's 13th District, including communities throughout our Nation, are forever grateful for the service of law enforcement officers, your service to your fellow man. So today, on behalf of millions of Americans, I simply say to each of you serving as law enforcement officers, thank you.

With that, I yield to a new colleague of mine from Texas, Mr. RATCLIFFE.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

This week, I was honored and grateful to be able to vote for and help pass several bills that will improve the lives of so many hardworking Americans.

Earlier today, I was proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. I am grateful to be pushing this bill across the finish line because the Keystone runs through the Fourth Congressional District that I am privileged to represent. It is a long overdue, commonsense piece of legislation which will create good-paying jobs, will grow our economy, and will support more manufacturing and trade in this country.

During its construction, it is estimated that 42,000 jobs will be created by the Keystone, and it will put more than \$2 billion in the pockets of American workers.

□ 1400

To put this impact in perspective, those 42,000 jobs are 12,000 more than the unemployed population in the Fourth Congressional District of Texas.

Unfortunately, President Obama has indicated that he will veto the Keystone if it passes both Houses. I hope that this is just an idle political threat because, if it is not, then the President is intentionally harming the middle class Americans that this great job creation bill is going to help.

I hope and pray that our President won't play politics with legislation

that will provide opportunities to create jobs for tens of thousands of Americans to support their families.

This week, I was also proud to be able to support H.R. 30, which changes the definition of a full-time employee from 30 hours a week to 40 hours a week under the perversely named Affordable Care Act.

ObamaCare's 30-hour rule places an impossible burden on individuals and small businesses in my district and across this country, and I am glad to be able to help pass a bill which repeals a terrible provision from a terrible law.

But I say we haven't gone far enough. I know the people that I represent in east and north Texas won't be satisfied until we repeal every provision of the Affordable Care Act.

I was sent here to Washington to deliver results for the hardworking people of north and east Texas, and these bills show that I am doing that, and it is what I intend to keep doing because, while these are great bills and I am proud that we passed them this week, it is just a start.

We need more good bills to combat the President's executive overreach; to restore fiscal sanity; to secure our borders; to repeal all of ObamaCare; and, most importantly, to defend our great Constitution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers for this time.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MOORE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of an unscheduled medical procedure.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 26. An act to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 12, 2015, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Subpart B — Rural Energy for America Program (RIN: 0570-AA76) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Credit Risk Retention (RIN: 2501-AD53) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

10. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Commercial Clothes Washers [Docket No.: EERE-2012-BT-STD-0020] (RIN: 1904-AC77) received January 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

11. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to North Korea that was declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

12. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency blocking property of the Government of the Russian Federation relating to the disposition of highly enriched uranium extracted from nuclear weapons that was declared in Executive Order 13617 of June 25, 2012; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

13. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

14. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

15. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone, Elizabeth River; Portsmouth, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-1032] (RIN-1625-AA00) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

16. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland

Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone: Carquinez Strait Cable Repair Operation, Martinez, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0950] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

17. A letter from the Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a letter notifying the Congress that the United States intends to join a consensus among Environmental Goods Agreement (EGA) participants to invite the Government of Iceland to join the current group of 13 WTO Members engaged in the EGA negotiations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 235. A bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 236. A bill to provide for the exchange of information related to trade enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 237. A bill to authorize the revocation or denial of passports and passport cards to individuals affiliated with foreign terrorist organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. TITUS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. MENG, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 238. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, with respect to the definition of "widow" and "widower", and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 239. A bill to preserve the Arctic coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska, as wilderness in recognition of its extraordinary natural ecosystems and for the permanent good of present and future generations of Americans; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 240. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ISSA, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. COOK, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. NUNES, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H.R. 241. A bill to amend the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 to impose notice

and a compliance opportunity to be provided before commencement of a private civil action; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. VELA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SIRES, Ms. LEE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. FARR, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 242. A bill to restore access to year-round Federal Pell Grants; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. NORTON, Ms. FLUDGE, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. JOYCE):

H.R. 243. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to publish a health advisory and submit reports with respect to Microcystins in drinking water; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 244. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for pharmacy benefits manager standards under the Medicare prescription drug program to further transparency of payment methodologies to pharmacies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ABRAHAM:

H.R. 245. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to codify certain existing provisions of law relating to effective dates for claims under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 246. A bill to improve the response to victims of child sex trafficking; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 247. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional gold medal to Maya Angelou in recognition of her achievements and contributions to American culture and the civil rights movement; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 248. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the employer health insurance mandate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 249. A bill to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 250. A bill to provide a permanent appropriation of funds for the payment of death gratuities and related benefits for survivors of deceased members of the uniformed services in event of any period of lapsed appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 251. A bill to transfer the position of Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs in the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Office of the Secretary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PETERS, Ms. HAHN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 252. A bill to provide housing assistance for very low-income veterans; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 253. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of small business start-up savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 254. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for start-up expenditures for business for 2015 and 2016; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 255. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for qualified manufacturing facility construction costs and to allow a credit against tax for qualified manufacturing facility construction costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 256. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for equity investments in research intensive small business concerns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 257. A bill to provide for United States participation in the Inter-Parliamentary Union, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TONKO,

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 258. A bill to establish the Federal Interagency Working Group on Reducing Poverty which will create and carry out a national plan to cut poverty in America in half in ten years; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 259. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for expenses for household and elder care services necessary for gainful employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 260. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide the work opportunity tax credit with respect to the hiring of veterans in the field of renewable energy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 261. A bill to prohibit monetary payments by the Federal Government to employees, officers, and elected officials of foreign countries for purposes of bribery, coercion, or any activity that is illegal or undermines the rule of law or corrupts a public officer or the office such officer represents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 262. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act so as to exempt real property from civil forfeiture due to medical-marijuana-related conduct that is authorized by State law; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 263. A bill to expand and enhance existing adult day programs for younger people with neurological diseases or conditions (such as multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, traumatic brain injury, or other similar diseases or conditions) to support and improve access to respite services for family caregivers who are taking care of such people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 264. A bill to provide for the issuance of a semipostal to benefit the Peace Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FARR, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 265. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to establish a public health insurance option; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 266. A bill to prohibit universal service support of commercial mobile service and

commercial mobile data service through the Lifeline program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SIREs:

H.R. 267. A bill to amend the Peace Corps Act to allow former volunteers to use the seal, emblem, or name of Peace Corps on death announcements and grave stones; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SIREs:

H.R. 268. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to encourage Canadian tourism to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 269. A bill to prohibit certain real property from being named after a sitting Member of Congress; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. STEWART, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida):

H.J. Res. 11. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of consecutive terms that a Member of Congress may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.J. Res. 12. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H.J. Res. 13. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. BLUM, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. DESANTIS):

H.J. Res. 14. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE:

H. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should provide, on an annual basis, an amount equal to at least one percent of United States gross domestic product (GDP) for nonmilitary foreign assistance programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. NEAL, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. GOWDY, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H. Res. 24. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require a reading of the names of members of the Armed Forces who died in the previous month as a result of combat; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. LEE (for herself and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Res. 25. A resolution recognizing the anniversary of the tragic earthquake in Haiti on January 12, 2010, honoring those who lost their lives, and expressing continued solidarity with the Haitian people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 235.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U. S. Constitution which gives Congress authority to “regulate Commerce . . . among the several States.”

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 236.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 3

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 237.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 10, 11, and 15

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 238.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 8 and Amendment XIV Sections 1 and 5

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 239.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 and Article IV, section 3.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 240.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: “No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . .” In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: “The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .” Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 241.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the

power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 242.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 243.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of Congress to regulate commerce as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, as applied to healthcare.

By Mr. ABRAHAM:

H.R. 245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 which grants Congress the power to regulate Commerce with the Indian Tribes.

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 in order to enforce treaties made between the United States and several Indian Tribes.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 1 and Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1) Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3)

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1) Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3)

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the US Constitution

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 260.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the US Constitution

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 261.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 264.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 265.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 2

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 266.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SIRE:

H.R. 267.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d) of rules XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 268.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d) of rules XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 269.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States which states: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ." This provision establishes the authority of Congress to appropriate funds, and place limitations and conditions on the use of those funds.

By Mr. BARR:

H.J. Res. 11.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority for this bill is stated in Article V of the U.S. Constitution, which establishes the method for enacting amendments to the Constitution.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.J. Res. 12.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this joint resolution is based is found in Article V of the Constitution, which grants Congress the authority, whenever two thirds of both chambers deem it necessary, to propose amendments to the Constitution.

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H.J. Res. 13.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V: "The Congress, whenever two thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states, or by conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

By Mr. SALMON:

H.J. Res. 14.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the U.S. Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 27: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 32: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 36: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. OLSON, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. YOHO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. COLE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. YODER, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GRIF-FITH, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. RUSSELL, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. BABIN, Mr. EMMER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BLUM, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BARR, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. COOK, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. POMPEO, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. BUCK, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LATTI, Mr. WALKER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. PALMER, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. HURT of Virginia.

H.R. 44: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 123: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 125: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 132: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 154: Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 159: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 160: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 167: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. ELLMERS, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. SALMON, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 169: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 173: Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BARR, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 185: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 191: Mr. MARINO, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. LOVE, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 203: Mr. KLINE, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 204: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 206: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 208: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 217: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 227: Mr. JONES and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 230: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 232: Mr. DENT.

H.J. Res. 7: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.J. Res. 8: Mr. HICE of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 2: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H. Res. 12: Mr. Yarmuth, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. GABBARD.

H. Res. 13: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on H.R. 37 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 185 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.R. 240, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JANUARY 9, 2015

No. 4

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of greatness, higher than the Heavens, may Your Name be praised. Lord, You fill our lives with good things. Fill our lawmakers with a reverence for You that will empower them to stand for right, whatever the consequences. Influence their thoughts, words, and actions, and keep them from the roads that lead to disunity. Lord, give them courage and resolve to glorify Your Name as they trust the unfolding of Your loving providence. Be their strength and shield this day and always.

We pray in Your powerful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE ACT— MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 1, S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed a bipartisan terrorism risk insurance bill and sent it to the President for signature. We worked with our colleagues in the House and on the other side of the aisle to quickly process that bill in a timely manner, and I thank the Speaker and all Members of the Senate for granting unanimous consent to set up those votes yesterday.

This morning we will continue to debate the motion to proceed to the Keystone bill. Chairman MURKOWSKI and several members of the energy committee will be here to talk about this bipartisan infrastructure bill.

No votes are scheduled for today, but we will have a cloture vote on the motion to proceed on Monday night. It is my hope that Chairman MURKOWSKI and Senator CANTWELL can begin the amendment process under the regular order. Unfortunately, some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to block our effort to even get on the bill, and therefore the cloture vote on Monday is required.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I am here this morning to once again talk about the Keystone XL Pipeline, the legislation we will be voting on next week. We will be voting on cloture on the motion to proceed to the legislation. Then, hopefully, we will be debating that bill and offering amendments, which is exactly what we are supposed to be doing in this Chamber.

On Thursday, yesterday, we had a hearing on the bill. In that hearing we brought the bill forward. It is a bill I have authored. JOE MANCHIN is the lead Democratic cosponsor. We have 60 cosponsors on the bill. So we have strong bipartisan support. It is the Keystone approval bill. Essentially, what it does is under the commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States, which authorizes Congress to oversee trade with foreign countries, we approve the Keystone XL Pipeline crossing the border from Canada into the United States.

A lot of people do not realize the pipeline carries domestic oil from places such as North Dakota and Montana—the Bakken region of our country—to refineries, and it carries both

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S121

Canadian and domestic crude. But part of the approval requires approval for crossing the border from Canada into the United States. Typically, that is done by a national interest determination by the President of the United States. But the President has been unwilling to do that now for more than 6 years.

The company that is trying to build this pipeline, TransCanada, applied for approval to build this project pursuant to other pipelines it had already built. The original Keystone had already been built. This is the Keystone XL sister pipeline. But in September 2008 they applied for approval to build the Keystone XL Pipeline and to get a cross-border permit determination by the President that, in fact, this vital energy infrastructure is in the national interest.

Well, more than 6 years have elapsed, obviously, since September 2008. The President has still not rendered a final decision, arguing that somehow the process has not been completed after more than 6 years. Of course, America was able to fight and win World War II in less than 6 years. But our President feels that somehow that process still has not been completed after more than 6 years on this project.

So, of course, the purpose of the bill is, in essence, to say: All right, Mr. President, if you will not approve this project, Congress will—under the commerce clause of the Constitution—which we have the authority to do. Earlier we passed legislation. As a matter of fact, I had written a bill in 2011, which we passed in 2012. We attached it to the payroll tax holiday, a bill that got 73 votes, as I recall, which required the President to make a decision. At that time the decision he made was no, on the basis of the route in Nebraska.

So what happened then in 2012 is that the good citizens of Nebraska went to work on a new route in Nebraska. The legislature, the Governor dealt with that new route, came up with a new route, and approved it overwhelmingly.

It was then subsequently challenged by opponents of the project. Some of the extreme environmentalists have continued to oppose the project, and so that decision went to the supreme court.

We learned today the supreme court has now decided in favor of TransCanada. The news came out this morning that yet another obstacle, after more than 6 years of obstacles, today has been taken care of. The problem is solved.

The Nebraska State Legislature ruled in favor of the Governor—Governor Dave Heineman, whom I know very well, the former Governor of Nebraska—and the legislature, and it said the way they sited this pipeline is, in fact, proper and upheld their decision. I will talk about that decision in a few minutes.

But the other thing I wish to talk about in terms of the Keystone Pipeline is the discussion we had yesterday

in the energy committee because it was an opportunity to begin the debate we are going to have on the floor next week. The proponents had an opportunity to state their positions and why, and the opponents had their opportunity to state their positions and why. So for several hours we began that debate. We then voted on the legislation and moved it out, without amendment, on a 13-to-9 vote. It was a bipartisan vote, 13 to 9, and we will have that bill for a vote on the floor Monday.

I wish to address some of the arguments the opponents put forward in opposition to this project. I will start with the Nebraska court decision because that was one of the issues brought up at our energy hearing yesterday. Some of the opponents of the project said: Well, you know what. The process hasn't been concluded—even though it has been going on for more than 6 years. I will put a diagram up here that shows the route of the pipeline.

As I mentioned, the original Keystone pipeline has already been built. That is the red. That has already been built. It was permitted. It took 2 years to permit and 2 years to build. I was actually Governor of North Dakota at that time. We can see it goes right through our State.

It seems to me that application was submitted by TransCanada in 2006. It was during the Bush administration, obviously. It was approved within 2 years, and the project was constructed within 2 years.

So from start to conclusion, 4 years to build this pipeline, which I think carries about 640,000 barrels of oil a day. It brings it down to Cushing so that oil can go into our oil refineries in the gulf. It also goes over here to Pato-ka, IL, so it can go to our refineries in the East.

Based on that project, there are 640,000 barrels a day. TransCanada wanted to build a second pipeline. This one is 830,000 barrels a day. I think it is about a \$7.9 billion project in all.

Not only does this project carry crude from Canada, our closest friend and ally, but it also brings oil out of this Bakken region in North Dakota and Montana. We put oil on it as well. So both Canadian and domestic crude are going to our refineries.

Again, it is just basic infrastructure that we need to move energy from where we produce it to where we refine it and consume it. We can't build an energy plan for this country without the necessary infrastructure. We have to have pipelines, roads, rail, and electric transmission lines to move electricity.

We cannot build what we want, which is either—some people refer to it as energy independence. I call it energy security. But, net, we produce more energy than we consume.

When we produce more energy than we consume, we get jobs, we get economic growth, we get national security because we don't have to depend on

places such as the Middle East or Venezuela or Russia—as does so much of Europe. Western Europe and Eastern Europe is dependent on Russia for their oil and gas. What a terrible situation for them. The people of this country don't want to depend on OPEC for their oil.

So we produce it here. We are doing that. You know what else. We are working with our closest friend and ally Canada, and already that is happening. We are already moving toward a situation—we already produce more natural gas, but soon, if we keep it up, we will produce more oil. Working together with Canada, we will get a little bit from Mexico, and we will produce more oil and gas than we consume.

Some call it energy independence—not really, because it is a global market for energy. But it is certainly energy security. We don't have to depend on anyone else for our energy because we have it right here.

Not only does that create jobs directly, but energy is a foundational industry for all of the other industry sectors. Think about it. If you are in manufacturing, high-tech—just name it—or if you are in farming, agriculture, you depend on energy. If you have lower costs and abundant, available energy, you are more competitive in the global economy, aren't you? So it is a foundational industry as well, and that is why we have to have this vital infrastructure as part of the energy building plan for our country.

It is working. Don't take my word for it. Drive to the gas station. Go on over there. Fill up your car. Look at the bill when you are done. It is a lot lower than it was a few years ago, right? Check it out.

Every consumer is benefiting at the pump. Small businesses are benefiting across the board. All the industry sectors benefit from lower oil and gas prices.

Why did that happen? OPEC decided to give us a Christmas present; is that what it is? I don't think so.

Russia decided: Oh, gee, to our friends in America, we better send them some oil to reduce the price at the pump. I don't think so.

It is because we are producing so much more oil and gas—not only in the Bakken and in the Eagle Ford formation in Texas, which are shale, clays for oil, but also natural gas in the Marcellus, other areas of our country—in the eastern part—and by working with our closest friend and ally, Canada. We are getting millions of barrels of oil from Canada.

So the oil we produce at home and the oil we get from Canada we don't have to get from Venezuela, we don't have to get from OPEC, we don't have to get from Russia, and we don't have to get from countries in Africa. When we send those dollars over to other countries, how are they using those dollars? Look at what is going on in Paris today.

How many of those petro dollars fund terrorist activities? Isn't it better, if

we are not going to produce that energy at home, that we get it from Canada? And isn't it better that we produce that energy at home?

How are we going to produce that energy at home if we don't have the infrastructure to move it from where it is produced to where it is consumed? Gee, then somebody will say: Well, yeah, that is just common sense, of course, right?

I mean, that is just basic common sense. Why aren't we doing it? Yet here we are in a process for more than 6 years still waiting to produce it because the extreme environmental interests have decided: Well, we just don't want to produce more oil. We don't want more oil produced in this country, and we don't want more oil produced in Canada.

Of course, you say: Well, then what? We keep buying it from Russia or we keep buying it from OPEC? Oh, no, no, no, we will just keep developing all these alternatives. I am all for developing all kinds of energy. I would say go ahead. Let's do it.

We worked hard in our State. We have not only oil and gas—we are now the second largest oil-producing State, second only to Texas, but we also produce natural gas. We have coal fired, we have solar, we have wind, we have biofuels. We have all of them. I am for all of them.

What I don't understand is how developing our oil and gas resources, building the vital infrastructure—how does that prevent us from developing any other type of energy? How does it prevent that? It doesn't.

It just makes sure that as we work on anything else, we don't have to continue to be dependent on OPEC or somebody else for our oil and gas. That is all we are doing.

So let's not sit here and pick winners and losers and do that kind of thing. Let's create the best business climate we can. Let's develop the vital infrastructure we need to move energy around our country, and let's truly become energy secure. That is what this project represents.

Make no mistake. At the end of the day, that is what this project is about. It has been held up for more than 6 years with hurdle after hurdle. Somebody says: Oh, well, gee, that is TransCanada. That is one company. Who cares about that?

Think about it. If you are going to build a pipeline or move energy around this country, if you are going to try to develop oil and gas—whether it is for Canada or anyone else—and you see a company that wants to build a simple pipeline—something that has been done, I think, 19 times before—and they have to spend billions of dollars and take years and years and years, and they still don't have it, are you still going to rush out and do that? Are you going to rush out and build a lot more infrastructure? Probably not.

So isn't this really about trying to shut her down? Isn't this the opponent

saying: No, we are going to shut down developing the energy resources in this country. We are not going to work with Canada to do it.

And then what do we end up doing? We say: Well, we will have all these other things.

Maybe we will, maybe we won't or maybe we will go right back to what has been happening—history tends to repeat itself—and we will go back to remaining dependent on OPEC oil, back to remaining dependent on OPEC. It has to be music to these guys' ears.

I wish to take a couple of minutes—I know the chairman of our energy committee will be coming to the floor and speaking on this issue as well—and work to rebut some of the other arguments that have been brought up on this issue, and some of these were brought up yesterday at our energy committee.

The first one, as I say, was: Well, look, the process isn't done because the decision in Nebraska hasn't been made.

Well, in fact, the decision in Nebraska has been made several times. Now the Nebraska Supreme Court put out a ruling today saying that it is fine. All the work the legislature in Nebraska did, all the work the Governor in Nebraska did—the rerouting in Nebraska is upheld.

That is done. That excuse is gone. As the House works to pass this bill today, and as we work to pass it next week, that argument is off the table. That has been taken care of.

The biggest argument is the environmental argument. The opponents say: Oh, well, it will produce greenhouse gas emissions. They are opposed to oil development because it produces greenhouse gas emissions.

Yet the environmental impact statement—I should say the multiple environmental impact statements done by the State Department—this is what they say. Understand there have been five different reports—three draft reports and two final reports—over a 6-year timeframe. The State Department has done this not once, not twice, but three times in draft form and two times in final form. They have gone in, and they have analyzed the environmental impact of this project.

When you read the report, do you know what it says? “No significant environmental impact” is what it says. That is the Obama administration's State Department environmental impact statement, after 6 years of study—not once, not twice, but five times between three draft statements and two final statements—“No significant environmental impact.” That is what it says.

It just stands to reason because if we don't build the pipeline, they pointed out, then what happens? Well, if you don't have this pipeline, the environmental impact statement pointed out that it will take 1,400 railcars a day to move that oil. So instead of moving that oil from Canada, not even counting—I mean, we have to move our oil

too. If we don't have the pipeline to move that oil in the safest, most cost-effective and efficient way, then it has to be moved by rail. If you don't have a pipeline, you have to move it by rail. Now you have 1,400 railcars a day creating congestion on the rail.

That creates more greenhouse gas, that creates more congestion, more difficulty in moving our ag products and other products.

We are already seeing that. We already have congestion on our rail that is backing up the shipment of other goods. We had a tremendous problem moving our ag goods this year. So are we going to have another 1,400 railcars on a railroad system that is already overloaded? It doesn't make much sense.

You know what. It creates more greenhouse gas. So by not having the pipeline, you increase the greenhouse gas emissions. I suppose Canada could say—although it is unlikely because they are already moving it by rail.

In my home State of North Dakota we are already moving 700,000 barrels a day by railcar because we can't get enough pipeline, and we are producing more oil. We are up to 1.2 million barrels a day, moving 700,000 barrels by railcars because we can't move it by pipeline, benefiting the rest of our country—light, sweet Bakken crude.

The other thing with Canada is they say: If we can't bring the pipeline down and work with our closest friend and ally, the United States, if they would rather work with—I don't know—OPEC than Canada—we can't figure that one out. I am sure Prime Minister Harper is saying: Oh, boy, that is unbelievable. But OK, then I guess what we will have to do is we will build these pipelines—and they are already in the process of doing so—to the west coast of Canada. We will load that oil on tankers, and we will send it all to China because China wants it. They are not only willing to buy the oil, but they are trying to buy the source of the oil.

So then it gets on the pipeline, and then it goes on tankers over to China. Well, those tankers produce greenhouse gas emissions as they haul that oil to China. In China the refineries have much higher greenhouse gas emissions. They are much less efficient. They are much less environmentally sound than our refineries in this country. So what do we end up with? We end up with much higher greenhouse gas emissions because we didn't have the pipeline.

Oh, and by the way, instead of us then refining it, tankers have to bring that petroleum to us from OPEC, from Russia, heavy crude from Venezuela, creating some more greenhouse gas. So the net effect is we have increased the environmental impacts by not allowing the pipeline. It increases it. It doesn't reduce it, it increases it.

Furthermore, Canada's laws, in terms of environmental stewardship, are tougher than ours, but they are continuing to move to what is called in situ development in the oil sands. What

is in situ development? In situ development is drilling and then the use of steam to bring up the oil rather than excavating, which is the traditional way they produce oil up here. So the greenhouse gas footprint is very similar to drilling in the United States. In fact, it has a lower footprint than the heavy crude that comes out of California—a very environmentally conscious State.

Again, when we talk about the environmental impact, let's talk about the facts. Let's talk about reality, and those are the facts. That is what it is truly about.

Safety is another thing they brought up. Something could happen with the pipeline. That is true, and we always have to work on safety. It is very important we always address safety in whatever we do. The best way to have a safe infrastructure system to move energy around this country is to have the right mix of pipelines and roads and rail—the right mix along with transmission lines—so we move all types of energy as safely and as effectively as possible.

This graph reflects the pipeline system in our country. Oil and gas are moving through millions and millions of miles of pipelines in our country. This pipeline is going to be the newest, with the latest and the best technology. Oh, by the way, if we don't have the pipeline, as I mentioned just a minute ago, we are adding 1,400 railcars a day. Everyone can do their own calculation, but do we think we are safer and more likely to have less accidents with another pipeline—with the latest, greatest technologies and safeguards—or would we rather have 1,400 railcars a day going through our communities loaded with oil? Common sense again, and the statistics support it.

There is more. They brought up more concerns, but I am nearing the end of my time, in terms of floor time right now, and I know our chairman is coming down, so I will have to wrap this up. I went a little longer on some of these issues they brought up, and they brought up others, but here is the good news. We are going to vote on a cloture motion to proceed to the bill on Monday. I am hopeful, with our 60 sponsors on this legislation—we will have 60, maybe 63 votes based on what people have indicated to me as to how they will vote right now—that after the vote on Monday we will be on the bill.

Unlike the past several years in the Senate, once we are on the bill, we will be open for business, and we are welcoming amendments. We are saying to Republicans and Democrats alike: Bring them on. Bring on your amendments. If you have a good idea, come on down. If you have a good idea, come on down and let's talk about your amendment. Let's debate your amendment, and you know what. You are going to get a vote, and if you get 60 votes in support of your amendment, then we will make it part of this legislation.

We are hopeful that in allowing amendments, we can improve the legislation, we can make it more bipartisan, and we can get more supporters, so if in fact the President does decide to veto it, we will have 67 votes instead of 60 or 63 votes. That is how the process is supposed to work. We are supposed to be able to have that debate, offer those amendments, and produce the best product we can. That is what we are hoping to do with this legislation.

We are also hoping that will not only generate more bipartisan support on this issue, on this legislation, but on other energy legislation and other legislation of all types so we can get the important work of the American people done in this body. That is what it is all about: finding a way to get things done—get the job done for the American people.

With that, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, yesterday morning those of us on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee had an opportunity for good discussion about our Nation's energy future. More specific to the agenda of yesterday's business meeting was a bill that would allow for a much-delayed project—the Keystone XL Pipeline—to advance. It moved through the committee favorably. It moved through the committee with bipartisan support.

As I noted to several colleagues yesterday, the discussion we had in the committee about the significance of this pipeline—the significance of its contribution to our Nation's economy from a jobs perspective and from a resource perspective is considerable. Obviously there was debate on both sides—I think good, healthy debate—and it is debate I hope we will see reflected on this floor in the next week and perhaps the week following as we have an opportunity to debate. But first we have to get onto that bill. We have that process in place. We will have a vote on the motion to proceed the first of next week.

I am anxious, as the new chair of the energy committee, to move the debate here in the Senate on issues that are so important to us in this Nation. When we think about our Nation's security—national security and energy security—and when we think about our Nation's economy and prosperity, so much of it comes back to energy, access to energy that is abundant, affordable, clean, diverse, and secure. These are principles I have laid out about my views of energy. I am hopeful that the discussion we will have on this floor will help advance us as a Senate, as a Congress, and really as a country in moving for-

ward on those policies that will only make us stronger and more secure.

I felt the debate yesterday in committee was kind of a precursor of some of the agenda items we will see on this floor that will be brought forward by way of amendments. I would encourage colleagues, as they think about next week and as they think about the debate we will have on energy, let's stick to energy. We haven't had a good, robust debate on energy in a long while.

We have a lot of other concerns. We have colleagues who want to bring up the President's initiatives as they relate to immigration or perhaps health care. We will have plenty of opportunity here in the Senate under Leader MCCONNELL's management to hear and debate issues that are of great substance and weight. But we have waited far too long for our energy issues to be fully debated on the floor, so I am welcoming that discussion.

We heard a lot of good reasons within the committee and we have heard a lot of good reasons here on the floor why the Keystone XL Pipeline is significant, is important to this country. This morning I wish to take a few moments to discuss some of the arguments that have been made against it and perhaps provide some context, some rebuttal, because I think it is fair to acknowledge that the Keystone XL Pipeline evokes some strong feelings, but not all of what we have heard is perhaps as factual as we would like it to be. As we note often around here, people are entitled to their own opinions, but they are not entitled to their own facts. So I would like to address some of the responses.

One of the issues we heard yesterday was that this bill is almost too much. Well, if those on the committee and on the floor would look directly to the language of the bill, it is pretty simple. The text of the full bill takes up fewer than two pages. It is roughly 400 words long. It doesn't take long to read or understand. It is pretty simple. It is a pretty simple measure. It approves this long-delayed cross-border permit that is needed to construct the Keystone XL Pipeline. That is all it does. It approves a permit. It doesn't give some grand sweetheart deal to a foreign company. It doesn't feather the nest of oil companies. It allows for a permit to cross the border between the United States and Canada to allow for a construction project, and it does this while protecting private property rights.

It allows Nebraska to find the best possible route for the pipeline, and it requires all State and local obligations to be fully met. This bill does not deal with routing through the States. It was suggested that somehow or other we here in the Senate and the House are kind of like a zoning committee. That is not what is happening. It doesn't deal with the routing. As we know, that discussion took place at the State level—and appropriately so. So what this measure does is it just allows for that cross-boundary permit.

Some of the other points raised were that somehow or other this bill provides subsidies—subsidies—whether to TransCanada or to others. It does not authorize a single taxpayer dollar for any purpose. It doesn't create any new tax credits. It doesn't reduce current tax rates. The bill is simply about approving the Keystone XL Pipeline. It is that simple.

I would encourage you to read it. Again, it is pretty brief.

Another question raised yesterday in committee: Why the urgency? Why the push right now? We are just in the first week of the 114th Congress. Why are we pushing so quickly to advance this?

Well, for new Members, such as the Presiding Officer, here today, this is the first opportunity you will have had to weigh in on the Senate floor on this very important legislation, but many of us who were here in the 113th Congress recall that it was just about 6 or 7 weeks ago that this same measure—in fact, the same language of this bill is what we had on this floor just before we departed at the end of the 113th Congress. We fell one vote short of cloture. We had 59 supporters in the Senate. We obviously had very significant Democratic support. Coming up with 59 votes was substantive. I think folks would remember that.

In effect, this is a little bit about unfinished business. We were working on it less than 2 months ago—a month and a half ago. We are now back in the 114th Congress. So what has changed? Well, what has changed is that the Presiding Officer is now a Member of the Republican Party, and our leader, Senator MCCONNELL, is leading the Senate. We are now in a new Congress with new leadership, and the bill that has been introduced by my friend and colleague from North Dakota has 60 cosponsors—60 cosponsors—not people who have said: Yes, I think I am going to vote for this bill. These are 60 who have committed and signed their names, and we now have enough votes to pass it in this Chamber. So I think that is a good sign.

I think it is not a bad sign that what we are starting with is a bill that is unfinished business but also a bill that has strong bipartisan support, with 60 cosponsors. It is not very often in this body that we have legislation that has that level of support. So why not start this new Congress off with something that enjoys bipartisan support? I don't think it was the intention of our leader to start off saying: By gosh, it is going to be Republican ideas only. We are trying to find those ideas and those issues that will advance our country. I believe that moving forward with the Keystone XL Pipeline is something that will advance the best interests of our country.

So when we talk about timing, I think it is important to note that this is not only a good time, it is the best time to bring up Keystone XL. Our colleagues on the other side of the building are taking up the Keystone XL Pipeline today.

We had, of course, good news coming out of Nebraska this morning with the announcement that that litigation has been resolved, if you will, with the courts effectively upholding the pipeline route.

There have been some on the other side of the aisle who have suggested that we shouldn't cut off a process, that we shouldn't move until things have been resolved in Nebraska. And there are some who would say: Well, OK, that is something we do need to consider. It has been suggested that until that has been resolved, action on the Keystone XL Pipeline is somehow or other premature or untimely.

I want to speak to the aspect of timeliness and whether we are moving too quickly. The Presidential approval process is actually another reason we are starting on this bill in this Congress. A final "yes" or "no" decision has now been delayed by more than 2,300 days. I think the exact number is 2,303, and we are counting. That is more than 6 years—not to build a pipeline; we are not talking about it taking 6 years to build the pipeline; we are talking about 6 years to approve a permit to cross from the Canadian side to the U.S. side. The energy committee is on its fourth chairman since the initial cross-border application was filed.

We have seen a lot of process. We have seen a lot of talk here in this body. Literally everything that has happened during the Obama administration—the legislation that has moved, regulations, all of the extracurricular stuff that goes on outside—that has all happened while the Keystone XL permit has been pending. One has to look at this and say: 2,300 days and counting, over 6 years—it is pretty clear to me that the President really doesn't want to make this decision, and so if the Congress can step in and make it happen, the Congress should step in and make it happen.

I mentioned the decision coming out of Nebraska this morning and the fact that it allows—the pipeline route was effectively upheld. So that aspect of the process that individuals have been waiting for I think we can fairly say has been resolved.

In the Statement of Administration Policy—effectively the veto threat the President has issued on Keystone XL that I would note he issued the day we gavelled into the 114th Congress, before we started any of our business. In his veto message, the President said the legislation would cut short consideration of important issues relevant to the national interests. Again, I would just ask anyone, really? Some 2,303 days and we think we are somehow or other cutting short a process?

In his veto SAP, he states further that "the bill would also authorize the project despite uncertainty due to ongoing litigation in Nebraska." Well, it looks as though that part of it has been resolved, so that can't be used as the excuse.

It is not just in that Statement of Administration Policy. Back in April

the Press Secretary for the President, Mr. Carney, stated, "Absent a definite route from Nebraska, the decision, as I understand, by State is that that can't continue until the situation in Nebraska is resolved." OK. We are letting you know now that the situation in Nebraska has been resolved.

Further, there was a statement that came out of the State Department on April 18 in which they note that a core reason for the delay is "the potential impact of the Nebraska Supreme Court case which could ultimately affect the pipeline route." All right. The State Department also has word now that we are no longer waiting for that.

So when one talks about timeliness, when one talks about why it is imperative that we allow this permit to proceed, it is because it has been 6 years. It is because the decks have been cleared. It is an infrastructure that will benefit our Nation as well as our friends to the northern border.

I would like to talk about the issue of job creation. We have talked a lot about the jobs that are created with a potential Keystone XL project. We heard in the committee discussion yesterday that, hey, this is not as advertised. There are only going to be about 55 permanent jobs and only 4,000 construction jobs that will be created.

We have been saying it is closer to 42,000 jobs. There is a lot of water in between 4,000 and 42,000. Who is correct? I think it is important to note that the numbers we are talking about are drawn from the State Department's final supplemental EIS. It is one of those situations where if you are opposed to it you are going to grab some low numbers, and if you are supportive of it you might grab the high numbers. But I think you need to read the whole thing in context, my friends.

The final supplemental EIS goes on to say:

Construction contracts, materials, and support purchased in the United States would total approximately \$3.1 billion, with another \$233 million spent on construction camps. During construction, this spending would support a combined total of approximately 42,100 average annual jobs and approximately \$2 billion in earnings throughout the United States.

It goes on further to say:

Approximately 16,100 would be direct jobs at firms that are awarded contracts for goods and services, including construction directly by Keystone. The other approximately 26,000 jobs would result from indirect and induced spending; this would consist of goods and services purchased by the construction contractors and spending by employees working for either the construction contractor or for any supplier of goods and services required in the construction process.

So, again, these aren't LISA MURKOWSKI's numbers that are drawn from the air or Senator HOEVEN, the sponsor of this bill, conjuring up these numbers. These are the numbers that come from the State Department's final supplemental EIS. This is what they are saying—42,100 average annual jobs, \$2 billion in earnings, 16,000 direct jobs,

26,000 jobs from indirect and induced spending.

The State Department estimates construction workers on a seasonal basis—4 to 8 months per period. On an annual basis that is 1,950 jobs per year for 2 years, and that is where they get the 4,000 construction jobs.

But think about it. The nature of the construction business is not that these are jobs in perpetuity. That means you build things, and once they are built you move on to build something else. Of course they are not permanent jobs because we are not in a permanent state of construction. The key here is to approve projects in a timely manner so that these good, skilled, qualified workers can go from one job to the next and have permanent, stable employment—not necessarily on the same project for their entire lifetime but to be able, as a welder, as a skilled technician, to move from one project to another.

I would support this project even if it were just 4,000 temporary jobs, but it is not. What we are talking about is supporting over 42,000 workers over a 2-year period. That is significant. It is significant given the unemployment levels we are at—we are at 5.6 percent now. Isn't this what we are wanting to do, to bring on new jobs?

In my State right now we are trying to figure out how we can move Alaska's natural gas to market, not only to benefit our State with revenues but to benefit jobs. We don't have a deal yet that allows us to build that pipeline, although our Governor today and our previous Governor and Governors before them have been working diligently to make that happen, and one of these days we are going to see it. But in the meantime, do you think Alaskans are saying: Well, we are not so sure we want this because these are only going to be temporary construction jobs. Absolutely not. We are building training facilities. We are getting our workforce kind of teed up for that day so that when it comes, we are ready because we want those construction jobs. We recognize it will be a construction project, and by its very definition it is not permanent.

Don't you think that bolsters my State's economy? Don't you think we are hoping every day that we are going to get moving on this project? Absolutely. Is it going to benefit my State? Yes. Is it going to benefit this country? Yes. Let's get moving on it, and let's get moving on Keystone XL.

I get a little frustrated when we talk about the jobs, and we have those who say we should dismiss the fact that if we can't get to a certain number of jobs, the project is not worthwhile. What we are doing is approving a non-subsidized, nonfederally funded project. This is not costing us anything. This will be a benefit to us. It is not an entire industry, nor is it a multiple-year funding authorization for transportation projects around the country. I think those kinds of comparisons are

inaccurate and to a certain extent unfair.

I suggest to those who criticize Keystone XL's job-creating potential to be careful. We don't want to put ourselves in a position where we are going to wind up opposing nearly all individual projects for any purpose all across the country just because they don't create enough jobs.

Take the Department of Energy's Loan Guarantee Program. It has funded some good programs, in my view, over the years. We have seen some renewable energy projects in recent years that I think have been beneficial to our region. By our count, more than one dozen of these projects would create less than 50 permanent jobs. We are not creating hundreds or even thousands of jobs. It will create less than 50 permanent jobs. One solar project created 7 permanent jobs, a wind project created 10, a geothermal project created 14, and we had a transmission line that created 15 permanent jobs. I think the question that has to be asked is: Should we have opposed these projects based on the number of permanent jobs that are associated with them? Is there a minimum number of jobs we are going to use as a benchmark for approval or denial or should we just be glad and encouraged when any new job is created because it means Americans have found steady work? This is what I thought we were working toward.

Keep in mind Keystone XL is one project. It is one project. It is one pipeline. There is one connector between Canada and the United States that connects up to a pipeline that has already been built in the South and will feed into our existing system. This is not brandnew frontier. We are allowing for a connector between Canada and the systems we have in the United States.

Keystone XL is one project. It is one small part of the employment that energy production and infrastructure development can provide for our Nation. We already have 19 cross-border oil pipelines. This is coming down from Canada in the North and coming up from Mexico in the South. We are already building up our LNG export capability and so much more.

Again, keep in mind this is not the first time there has been a request for a cross-border pipeline. We have 19 that are already in place. What makes this one so special?

I will have more to say on that issue in the future. I know our leaders are expected to come down to the floor shortly. I look forward to a good, honest debate about our energy resources, our energy opportunities, and our energy challenges. I think the American public is ready for this discussion.

I don't know what happens around the dinner table in the hometowns of Georgia, but I can tell you in Alaska we talk a lot about energy, and we don't talk about it because we are an energy-producing State. We talk about it because it costs us a lot of money to keep warm in a cold place. It costs us

a lot of money because we are not part of anybody else's energy infrastructure.

We don't have transmission lines that connect us from one place to the other. We have what we have, and we are thankful to have it. We are ready to share it with others around the country and around the globe, but we in Alaska talk a lot about the affordability of our energy resources. We talk a lot about how we can access our abundant resources. We talk a lot about how to use our ingenuity and technology to advance us so we can have cleaner energy sources and move to a world of renewable energy, and that is so exciting for us.

We have a lot of fossil fuel in Alaska—and we have a lot of everything else—and we are excited to be developing our geothermal, our marine hydrokinetic, our biomass, our wind potential, and our solar potential. It is a little dark there now, but our solar potential in the summer is second to none.

We are excited as to what we might be able to do in understanding how we can tap into ocean energy resources. It is exciting. We need to do more as a nation when it comes to efficiency and conservation. We should be leading in that way, and that is why I am pleased we will have an opportunity to again revisit the merits of the legislation my friends Senator PORTMAN and Senator SHAHEEN have been working on so long as it relates to energy efficiency and taking that up as an opportunity for amendment. We have such good issues to talk about—issues that the American public is talking about because it impacts them, and it impacts their family budget. It impacts their opportunities for jobs, and it impacts our Nation's security.

I have not talked today about the security aspects of it, but it doesn't take a foreign policy analyst to understand that gaining the benefit from an energy resource from our friends in Canada is better than asking for that same resource from the OPEC nations or Venezuela or from any nation that might not like us. That is a debate that again is so core to what we are talking about with Keystone XL.

We have a healthy relationship with Canada. It is important because when someone drives to my State, which is a heck of a long drive, they have to go through more of Canada than anyplace else. I want to have a good relationship with Canada, but I can tell you our friends on the Canadian border are wondering what is happening in the United States. It has been 2,303 days, and we can't make a decision on whether we should benefit from a jobs perspective, an economic perspective, and a national security perspective.

I look forward to the discussion next week, and I look forward to a robust and full debate on good energy amendments that will be coming before this body.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor this morning to talk about the Keystone XL Pipeline. I see my colleague from Alaska is here this morning, and I think she and I were thinking we would be continuing this debate next Monday as the Senate moves forward on the motion to proceed to rule XIV of the bill that relates to this issue. Obviously we had committee action yesterday, but we are both here this morning.

I wish to say to my colleague before she leaves the floor that I do look forward to the opportunity where she and I can sit down and talk about an energy strategy and other issues that will help move our country forward so we can produce jobs.

I had a chance to work with Senator MURKOWSKI's father and other Republicans on the energy committee. We produced some very good energy legislation in both 2005 and 2007 that did result in moving our country forward. It was bipartisan legislation and definitely not unanimous. I mean, there was a great deal of debate about them, but we got them done nonetheless. I am looking forward to working with the Senator from Alaska on these issues.

It is probably safe to say the Senator from Alaska and I had plans this morning other than coming to the Senate floor; nonetheless, I am more than happy to talk about the recent decision by the Nebraska Supreme Court and how Congress will continue to discuss the issue of Keystone XL approval. Many of my colleagues probably know that the House will take up this action sometime today. The President has consistently said he is interested in having the process play out in Nebraska before he makes a decision about whether this pipeline is in the national interest. The President of the United States and the State Department have the authority and responsibility to look at this issue as it relates to what is in the national interest of the United States of America.

This decision by the Nebraska Supreme Court today is a very interesting decision. It is a very interesting decision because a majority of the Nebraska Supreme Court, four out of the seven justices on the court, said this law was unconstitutional—this attempt to circumvent the public interest process by which the citizens of Nebraska can raise concerns about a pipeline going through their community. The majority of the supreme court said, yes, that decision to short circuit the public process in Nebraska was unconstitutional.

Unfortunately for those citizens in Nebraska and those citizens in the

United States of America who want to make sure the environmental security issues and economic issues are fully discussed, they are getting shut down by a supermajority of the Nebraska Supreme Court. They failed to get five out of the seven supreme court justices to side with them. Nonetheless, I think there is a lot in this decision for all of us to think about; that is, just how much this process has been circumvented.

To me it is very unusual that the Senate would be asked to vote on a bill that would expedite the siting of a pipeline through the United States of America simply because a Canadian company wants us to do so. It is perplexing to me because I hear a lot of people talk about our neighbors, and I definitely value the relationship that the United States and Canada have. We are in the process of a major discussion with them on issues that impact the Pacific Northwest, and we have to work with our neighbors.

I am struck that my state has a great relationship with British Columbia, which is Washington's neighbor to the north. Sixty-eight percent of British Columbian residents oppose a tar sands pipeline across their province. That is right, a Canadian province definitely does not want a tar sands pipeline going through their neighborhood.

We have First Nations all across Canada who don't want tar sands development and pipelines across Canada. In addition, there are a lot of concerns about environmental practices for tar sands production that are in place in Alberta.

People should know that the oil and gas producing province of Alberta, not the federal government of Canada, regulates tar sands development. Alberta does not require what we in the U.S. would consider "best practices" for development of some of the dirtiest oil production in the world. In the U.S., we actually have federal laws that make oil production cleaner than in Alberta.

There is a lot of concern about these not only tar sands production, but also about byproducts, such as pet coke. As my colleague from Michigan stated in our business meeting yesterday, uncovered pet coke mounds, which could just blow around in the wind, caused serious environmental concerns in Michigan and Illinois. In addition, I am sure my colleague from California has been down here talking about benzene, which is a byproduct that is left behind and can adversely affect individuals.

To say that just because this Nebraska court decision became final today, that all those environmental issues and public safety issues have gone away, is surely a misstatement. Congress is being pressured to make a sweetheart deal for a business interest.

I believe tar sands producers should pay into the oil spill liability trust fund, just as companies that produce other oil products have to do. This is a very important issue for me because oilspills are a situation that we in the

Pacific Northwest have cared about for a long period of time. In fact, the Commandant of the Coast Guard appeared before the Senate commerce committee last year, and I had a chance to ask the commandant whether the Coast Guard had a way to respond to a tar sands oilspill, and he basically told me that, no, they didn't.

So, to me, there are a lot of environmental issues, a lot of process issues, and issues of paying a fair share for helping to clean up oilspills—and these issues all add up to serious concerns with legislatively approving a construction project. My colleagues on the other side want to turn Congress into a siting commission, to give a special interest the certainty to move forward on a project that needs to go through the proper process and channels.

In the State of Nebraska, the public said we have concerns about a tar sands pipeline running through our state, straight through the environmentally sensitive Sand Hills region and the Ogallala Aquifer, which provides drinking water to six states. Instead of dealing with those environmental issues, the company and its advocates came to the Congress and tried to get that route approved. This is why the President had to reject the proposal in 2012—because TransCanada did not want to do right by the citizens of Nebraska or the environment.

The long and short of it is, if TransCanada had been successful in getting the original route approved, that pipeline would go across the Ogallala Aquifer. There is now a broad consensus that this would have been the wrong route, endangering the water supply in America's agricultural heartland.

So, thank God, Congress, which tried to act and give a sweetheart deal to TransCanada, was thwarted by the President. The President said, I cannot approve this project now. And guess what happened. The company said, yes, that is right; we have to figure out a better route for the pipeline. And TransCanada had to start the process all over with a new application for a better route through Nebraska.

In my State, a utility and transportation commission—in the State of Nebraska I think it is called a public service commission—oversees the siting process for these kinds of infrastructure projects. That commission has a public process and answers all of the questions the public raises, debates the issues that are before the public and makes sure those issues are taken into account—I know many of my colleagues probably can relate to this more from the perspective of siting transmission lines or a grid system. I am sure people have seen a neighborhood complaining about a transmission line going through their neighborhood. This is a pipeline, and for us pipelines are very important in the Pacific Northwest. We had a natural gas pipeline that blew up, killing some young children in the Bellingham area. So, for me, pipeline siting, and the process

that goes into assuring the safety and security of the siting, should be decided in the broad daylight of public discussion through the proper channels. In this case, people circumvented that public commission process in Nebraska, circumvented what would have been a utilities and transportation commission process, and let the Governor decide the route. Then the decision was sent to the Nebraska Supreme Court to determine whether in fact the Governor had the authority to do that. Four of those seven justices said it was unconstitutional—not the supermajority for sure, but four of them said it was unconstitutional. But nothing in that decision corrected the original problem of them circumventing the environmental and economic and security issues that a public commission is supposed to go through in this process.

I ask my colleagues, why are we in such a big hurry to make this decision on behalf of a utility commission and on behalf of the President of the United States when there are real issues of safety and security that need to be discussed?

Next week my colleagues are going to have a lot of discussion on a lot of different amendments, but I still advocate that Congress has no business deciding for a special interest where a pipeline should go without the due process of citizens who are affected by pipeline having input to the decision.

I hope my colleagues will continue to let the process play out. I hope my colleagues will care more about public process and public interest than special interest. There is a great article, which I will submit for the RECORD, in Business Week citing welding issues with the current Keystone Pipeline. That existing pipeline has had safety problems.

We in the Pacific Northwest celebrate that we are a gateway to Asia, and we celebrate the fact that a lot of people will want to use that gateway. But we are very concerned about due process for infrastructure projects. We see other countries wanting to move energy and other products through our gateway when safety, security, environmental, and public issues are not being fully addressed.

I hope my colleagues will continue to make sure due process is given and that we will continue to make sure all of these public interest and environmental issues are addressed.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

I see the leader on the floor, so I will not suggest the absence of a quorum.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING FACTORY SERVICE AGENCY

• Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, Louisianians are well-known for our delicious food, rich cultural traditions, and enthusiasm for football. Less well known, but just as important, is our deep appreciation for reliable air conditioning. During the muggy summer months, every Louisianian needs a reliable air conditioning contractor on speed dial. As the newly elected chairman of the Senate Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee, I am honored to recognize a small business from my State that provides this vital service to its customers—the Factory Service Agency—which is celebrating its 40th year of operation this year.

Based out of Metairie, LA, Factory Service Agency serves the entire New Orleans metro area. While the business encompasses a multitude of mechanical and general contracting specialties, the primary focus is on the installation, service, and maintenance of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning equipment. This longstanding Louisiana business emphasizes its middle name—“service”—and truly provides outstanding customer service, including 24-hour emergency assistance and maintenance for airflow and ductwork problems. For four decades, Factory Service Agency has gone above and beyond to supply quality products and service to local hospitals, universities, manufacturing facilities, nursing homes, and more.

Small businesses provide the backbone for our economy, and their successes would not be possible without the direction of exceptional leaders. Mike Mitternacht, the owner of Factory Service Agency, is not only responsible for all operations of the business, but also makes representing small businesses across the State a top priority. Over the years, Mike Mitternacht has served on a variety of notable government and business organizations. In addition to his chairmanship of the statewide Louisiana Economic Development Small Business Advisory Council, he has served as the chairman of the Louisiana Association of Business and Industry and as a member of the National Federation of Independent Business, Louisiana Workforce Investment Council, and the National Small Business Association, the last of which he was named the 2010 Advocate of the Year. Small businesses across the country are fortunate to have a strong proponent with such valuable experience in each aspect of business operations, including financial management, job coordination, and project management.

For my first small business of the week as chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I am honored to recognize a local business that has not only flourished, but has been an inspiration

for entrepreneurs in Louisiana and across the country. Small businesses consistently provide unmatched attention, communication, and results to their customers, and I am proud to advocate for them. Once again, I congratulate Factory Service Agency on an exceptional 40 years and wish them continued success in the future.●

REMEMBERING SERGEANT STEPHEN R. PAQUIN

• Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, today I have the solemn duty of memorializing SGT Stephen R. Paquin, a soldier and native of Nashua, NH, who passed away on December 16 at the age of 27. After serving two tours in Afghanistan and a tour in Europe, Sergeant Paquin had recently transitioned from active duty into the U.S. Army Reserves and was training to become a drill sergeant with 1st Battalion, 304th Regiment in Londonderry. Born and raised in Nashua by his parents Kenneth and Paula alongside his brother Shawn, he was a graduate of the University of New Hampshire and Nashua High School South, where in his senior year Stephen was a member of the Purple Panthers 2005 State championship baseball team.

Stephen will forever be a member of the special community of Americans who selflessly defend our country so that the rest of us may continue to live in peace and freedom. He bravely joined the military at a time when it was almost guaranteed that new recruits would be called on to serve in a dangerous warzone far from home. It is my hope that during this extremely difficult time, Stephen's family and friends will find comfort in knowing that Americans everywhere deeply appreciate his commitment to our Nation.

Stephen is survived by his parents, Kenneth and Paula, his brother Shawn D. Paquin, and Christine Smith of Waltham, MA, his grandmothers Gloria Paquin of Nashua and Carol Mulligan of Dracut, MA, many aunts, uncles, cousins, and friends. This patriot will be missed by all.

On behalf of the people of New Hampshire, I ask my colleagues and all Americans to join me in honoring the life and service of this brave American, SGT Stephen Paquin.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:55 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 30. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 30-hour threshold for classification as a full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and replace it with 40 hours.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE
RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under the order of the Senate of January 6, 2015, the Secretary of the Senate, on January 9, 2015, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 26. An act to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER
COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-172. A communication from the Federal Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Reduction of Fees for Trademark Applications and Renewals" (RIN0651-AC94) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-173. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report on Adjustments of Status Granted Under Section 13 of the Act of September 11, 1957"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-174. A communication from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report on the Continuing Need for Authorized Bankruptcy Judgeships"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-175. A communication from the Project Manager, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Notices of Decisions and Documents Evidencing Lawful Status" (RIN1615-AC01) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-176. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of proposed legislation; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-177. A communication from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Commission's competitive sourcing efforts during fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-178. A communication from the Director, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Direct Investment Surveys: BE-13, Survey of New Foreign Direct Investment in the United States" (RIN0691-AA82) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-179. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes"

(RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-1067) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 13, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-180. A communication from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Board's competitive sourcing efforts for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-181. A communication from the Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Administration's decision to enter into a contract with a private security screening company to provide screening services at Portsmouth International Airport (PSM); to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-182. A communication from the Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Administration's decision to enter into a contract with a private security screening company to provide screening services at Dawson Community Airport (GDV), Glasgow International Airport (GGW), Havre City-County Airport (HVR), Wolf Point International Airport (OLF), and Sidney-Richland Municipal Airport (SDY); to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-183. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "Fundamental Properties of Asphalts and Modified Asphalts—III"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-184. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Closure of the 2014 Trimester 2 Directed Longfin Squid Fishery" (RIN0648-XD378) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-185. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer" (RIN0648-XD609) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-186. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Aggregated Large Coastal Sharks (LCS) and Hammerhead Sharks in the Atlantic Region" (RIN0648-XD636) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-187. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2014 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Gag" (RIN0648-XD599) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on

December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-188. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2014 Gulf of Alaska Pollock Seasonal Apportionments" (RIN0648-XD627) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-189. A communication from the Deputy Director, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Boundary Expansion of Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary" (RIN0648-BC94) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 24, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-190. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2014 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Atlantic Migratory Group Cobia" (RIN0648-XD601) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-191. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer" (RIN0648-XD638) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-192. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XD631) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-193. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Northern Rockfish in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XD632) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-194. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Gulf of Alaska Trawl Economic Data Report" (RIN0648-BE09) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-195. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; 2006 Consolidated Atlantic Highly Migratory Species (HMS) Fishery Management Plan; Amendment 7” (RIN0648-BC09) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-196. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan; Trawl Rationalization Program; Chafing Gear Modifications” (RIN0648-BC84) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-197. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; 2014 Commercial Fishing for Pacific Bluefin Tuna in the Eastern Pacific Ocean; Commercial Retention Limit” (RIN0648-BE58) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-198. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Restrictions on the Use of Fish Aggregating Devices in Purse Seine Fisheries for 2015” (RIN0648-BE36) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-199. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Taking of Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fishing Operations and Atlantic Coastal Fisheries Cooperative Management Act Provisions; American Lobster Fishery” (RIN0648-BE57) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-200. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revisions to Framework Adjustment 51 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan and Sector Annual Catch Entitlements; Updated Annual Catch Limits for Sectors and the Common Pool for Fishing Year 2014” (RIN0648-XD354) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 22, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-201. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

“Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; Framework Adjustment 3” (RIN0648-BE01) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-202. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; 2015 Atlantic Shark Commercial Fishing Seasons” (RIN0648-XD276) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-203. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Chinook Salmon Bycatch Management in the Gulf of Alaska Non-Pollock Trawl Fisheries; Amendment 97” (RIN0648-BD48) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-204. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod Pot Gear Fishing Closure in the Pribilof Islands Habitat Conservation Zone in the Bering Sea; Amendment 103” (RIN0648-BC34) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-205. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone: Carquinez Strait Cable Repair Operation, Martinez, CA” (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0950) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-206. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Regulated Navigation Area; Arthur Kill, NY and NJ” (RIN1625-AA11) (Docket No. USCG-2013-1063) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-207. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone: Christina River; Wilmington, DE” (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-1033) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-208. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zones Within the Captain of the Port New Orleans Zone, Louisiana” (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0993) received during adjournment of the

Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-209. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Anchorage Regulations: Anchorage Grounds, Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, California” (RIN1625-AA01) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0841) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-210. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Regulated Navigation Area; Herbert C. Bonner Bridge, Oregon Inlet, NC” (RIN1625-AA11) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0987) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-211. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone: Reduced Visibility, Sector St. Petersburg Captain of the Port Zone, FL” (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-1013) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-212. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone: Kent Narrows Draw Bridge Repairs, Kent Island Narrows; Queen Anne’s County, MD” (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0898) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-213. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revision of Safety/Security Zone Regulations; 2014 Tampa Bay; Captain of the Port St. Petersburg Zone, FL” (RIN1625-AA87) (Docket No. USCG-2013-0040) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-214. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for the State of New Jersey” (RIN0648-XD571) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-215. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments” (RIN0648-BE64) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 19, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-216. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2014 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for the South Atlantic Porgy Complex" (RIN0648-XD388) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WICKER:

S. 143. A bill to allow for improvements to the United States Merchant Marine Academy and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. SHELBY):

S. 144. A bill to prohibit the Federal Government from mandating, incentivizing, or making financial support conditioned upon a State, local educational agency, or school's adoption of specific instructional content, academic standards, or curriculum, or on the administration of assessments or tests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 23

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 23, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, with respect to the definition of "widow" and "widower", and for other purposes.

S. 30

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 30, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-

time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 117

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) were added as cosponsors of S. 117, a bill to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, to relocate to Jerusalem the United States Embassy in Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 119

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 119, a bill to amend the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act to provide for a lifetime National Recreational Pass for any veteran with a service-connected disability.

S. 123

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 123, a bill to prevent a taxpayer bailout of health insurance issuers.

S. 126

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 126, a bill to provide a permanent deduction for State and local general sales taxes.

S. 129

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 129, a bill to repeal executive immigration overreach, to clarify that the proper constitutional authority for immigration policy belongs to the legislative branch, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 25

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor

of S. Res. 25, a resolution commemorating 50 years since the creation of the Medicare and Medicaid Programs.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to Cathy Cahill for the 114th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m., Monday, January 12; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1, the Keystone bill, with the time until 5:30 p.m. equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. The first vote of the week will occur at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, on cloture on the motion to proceed to the Keystone bill.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 2015, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. McCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:08 p.m., adjourned until Monday, January 12, 2015, at 2 p.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF THE LIFE
OF GERALD "JERRY" LEE

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Gerald "Jerry" Lee, who was born in San Francisco on August 15, 1952, and died on December 24, 2014, at the age of 62 in his home city. Jerry, the son of Fon Yook Lee and Sai Soo Lee, was raised in San Francisco and attended Washington Irving Elementary, Francisco Junior High, and Galileo High School, City College of San Francisco and San Francisco State University.

Jerry and his wife Beverly Chin were married in San Francisco in 1975, and gave so generously of their time and considerable talents to their community. They devoted countless hours to causes including: the San Francisco Chinese New Year Parade; Self-Help for the Elderly; Chinatown Community Development Center; Community Youth Center of San Francisco; Cameron House; Wu Yee Children's Services; United Way of the Bay Area; Have a Ball Foundation; Salvation Army; APA Family Services; Glide Memorial Church; the San Francisco Junior Giants; Big Brothers and Big Sisters; On Lok; Boys & Girls Club; Angel Island Immigration Station Foundation, and the Asian Police Officers Association. Jerry's commitment to his community included being an ardent supporter of the San Francisco Giants and the 49ers.

Jerry worked at United Parcel Services for more than four decades, beginning as a loader and climbing the corporate ladder to the position of Community Affairs Manager. At UPS, he took on special assignments at the regional and corporate levels and was recognized for his work as the United Way Coordinator and Congressional Awareness Coordinator. As UPS's representative he formed close relationships with California's non-profit organizations, providing them with grants and sponsorships and coordinated teams of volunteers to support the needs of the community.

Jerry was appointed by Mayor Art Agnos to form San Francisco's Department of Parking and Traffic. Jerry also served as Chair of the City's Taxi Committee and was an important part of the development of the industry's manual. Mayor Gavin Newsom appointed Jerry to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Board of Directors and he was re-appointed to this position by Mayor Ed Lee.

Jerry is survived by his beloved spouse Beverly; his children Kimberly, Corbett and Bennett, and his mother Sai Soo Lee. He was preceded in death by his father and he also leaves his sisters Aimee, Vickie, Marie and Patricia, and many aunts, uncles, cousins, nieces and nephews.

I had the privilege of working with Jerry Lee on many efforts. I saw first-hand his great enthusiasm for collaboration, a deep sense of pride in all the employees at UPS and an un-

swerving commitment to his community rooted in patriotism, decency and integrity. He was a trusted friend and an extraordinary partner, and I join the many in our region in grieving his loss.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the extraordinary life and great accomplishments of a proud American, Jerry Lee. We are a better community and a stronger country because of him.

IN HONOR OF ROCK SCULLY

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and accomplishments of a truly remarkable man and to mourn the passing of a dear friend, Rock Scully. Rock passed away just before Christmas following a long battle with cancer. The world knew Rock as the man who managed the Grateful Dead from their inception in San Francisco through their rise to prominence to become music legends. I knew Rock as the new kid in the 6th grade who became my lifelong friend. Rock taught the Dead about business. He taught me how to ski. We grew up together, spent time together exploring the wonders of Carmel-by-the-Sea, and later traveling together to serve in interfaith peace camps in Germany and Austria in 1958. Some of my fondest memories were created with Rock. As a Member of this House, I rise to honor Rock's contribution to American culture. But as SAM FARR, I rise today to shed tears for the loss of a friend who I had known for 61 years.

Rock was born in Seattle in 1941. I first met him when he moved to Carmel in 1952. We became friends in grammar school and went to Carmel High School together before he moved to Switzerland to finish his senior year. Rock attended Earlham College in Indiana before moving back to California for graduate school in San Francisco.

Rock began his public career in the early 1960s, while studying at San Francisco State College. He helped organize civil rights demonstrations to fight discrimination in San Francisco including the now famous sit-ins at the Sheraton Palace Hotel and at automobile dealerships on Van Ness Avenue in 1964. The sit-ins were successful in improving hiring practices and creating agreements of non-discrimination. They also caused Rock and others to spend 30 days in the San Bruno county jail for disturbing the peace.

At the same time, Rock found his calling in San Francisco's fledgling rock music scene. He became the manager of The Charlatans, one of the originators of what became known as the San Francisco Sound in the 1960s. He also helped support the fledgling rock scene as part of a collective known as the Family Dog.

Just before I left to join the Peace Corps, Rock called to tell me he was going to quit

graduate school to manage a new band full time. "You're crazy!" I said. Rock told me they were amazing and definitely going places. "Besides," he said, "they have the coolest name: the Grateful Dead." Rock may have been crazy but he was right. The Dead was a local Bay Area act when he started managing them in 1965. The band became an American icon in the two decades he was with them. Bob Weir of the Grateful Dead put it beautifully in a message he posted upon learning of Rock's death, "Rock helped explain the Dead to the world."

Rock chronicled his twenty years with the band in his book "Living with the Dead." He became a voice for the narrative history of musicians and artists that changed the cultural landscape of California. In many ways he was part of the broad and varied movement that helped shape California's openness to innovation, creativity, and diversity. That movement can be traced at the University of California, Santa Cruz, whose library houses the complete archives of the Grateful Dead.

Rock played such a huge part in so many lives, but especially to his family and friends. I want to extend my condolences to his daughter, Sage Scully and stepdaughter, Acacia Scully; half sisters, Norah Scully and Kate Scully; step sisters, Julie Mayer Vognar and Amanda Mayer Stinchecum; and his brother, Dicken Scully, who travelled with us in Europe in 1958.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for the whole House in celebrating Rock Scully's amazing spirit and in offering our best wishes to his family and friends. To quote the band that Rock managed for two decades, "A box of rain will ease the pain and love will you see you through."

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF
GERALD LEE

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Gerald "Jerry" Lee. Jerry was born on August 15, 1952, in San Francisco, California, where he attended Washington Irving Elementary School, Francisco Junior High School, and Galileo High School. He went on to attend City College of San Francisco and San Francisco State University.

Jerry's firsthand knowledge of San Francisco and dedication to improving public transit and the MUNI system provided him the experience necessary to excel as the United Parcel Service's (UPS) Community Affairs Manager. Jerry began working for UPS 43 years ago as a loader. Jerry was recognized for his work as the United Way Coordinator and Congressional Awareness Coordinator. As the Community Awareness Coordinator, Jerry worked one-on-one with California's non-profit organizations, he extended grants and sponsorship

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

opportunities, and coordinated volunteers to support the work of the community.

Jerry dedicated his life to serving the residents of his hometown. While working for UPS, Jerry also served as a special assistant to San Francisco Mayor Art Agnos in 1988. In this position, Jerry established the Department of Parking and Traffic. He also served as Chairman of Mayor Agnos' Taxi Committee where he wrote the taxi industry's manual and created a management structure for over three hundred parking control officers. In 2008 Jerry was appointed by Mayor Gavin Newsom to join San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's (SFMTA) Board of Directors, and was later re-appointed by Mayor Ed Lee. Jerry served as SFMTA Vice Chairman until 2010 before becoming Chair of the Board's Policy and Governance Committee.

Jerry also served as a member of the city's Citizen's Advisory Committee as well as Self-Help for the Elderly's Board of Directors. He and his wife, Beverly, were actively involved in their community, working with the San Francisco Chinese New Year Parade, Chinatown Community Development Center, Community Youth Center of San Francisco, Cameron House, Wu Yee Children's Services, United Way of the Bay Area, Have a Ball Foundation, Salvation Army, APA Family Services, Glide Memorial Church, the San Francisco Junior Giants, Big Brothers and Big Sisters, On Lok, Boys & Girls Club, Angel Island Immigration Station Foundation, and the Asian Police Officers Association.

Jerry is survived by his wife Beverly; his children Kimberly, Corbett, and Bennett; his mother Sai Soo Lee; and his sisters Aimee, Vickie, Marie and Patricia; and his aunts, uncles, cousins, nieces, and nephews. Jerry was preceded in death by his father, Fon Yook Lee. To his fellow committee members and fellow organization members, Jerry will be missed and never forgotten.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AND FAMILIES

HON. RYAN A. COSTELLO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the dedicated men and women who serve and protect our communities every day as members of police departments large and small.

In recent months, we have seen chilling examples of how a lack of appreciation and respect for these men and women can rip apart communities and result in senseless and lethal violence.

All of us would be well-served to remember that the men and women who pin on a badge every day are not just police officers. They are also husbands and wives; mothers and fathers; brothers and sisters; aunts and uncles.

We should all recognize that police officers do more than just patrol our streets. They are part of our community.

In light of recent events, it is important to express our gratitude and offer a simple "thank you" to the countless law enforcement officers who serve with valor and distinction.

I had the honor of doing just this last weekend in West Chester, and again will have the

honor of doing so this weekend in Berks County. Let us all be solemnly reminded that the Thin Blue Line is willing to risk their own safety so that our loved ones, our homes and our businesses are protected.

So ahead of this upcoming weekend, I want to personally thank the efforts of retired Reading Police Lieutenant Michael Kurtz, Tricia Wertz—a widow of fallen Reading Police Officer Scott Wertz—and many, many others as the Berks County community will unite to show respect and in the spirit of building stronger, safer communities where all lives matter.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 2015 I missed recorded votes #1–7 as I was attending the funeral of Governor Mario Cuomo in New York.

I would like to reflect how I would have voted if I were here and sworn into office:

On Roll Call #1 I would have voted present (Quorum Call).

On Roll Call #2 I would have voted for NANCY PELOSI for Speaker.

On Roll Call #3 I would have voted "no" (Motion to Table).

On Roll Call #4 I would have voted "no" (Previous Question).

On Roll Call #5 I would have voted "yes" (Motion to Commit).

On Roll Call #6 I would have voted "no" (Passage of House Rules Package).

On Roll Call #7 I would have voted "yes" (Passage "Hire More Heroes Act" H.R. 22).

HONORING AMERICA'S PEACE OFFICERS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, everyday men and women of the police force put on their uniform and head out into the unknown. They encounter callous criminals and outlaws who have no regard for the law or their fellow man.

But yet every day, these police officers still get up and put on the uniform. They bravely face what could very well be some of the most dangerous situations and potentially their last moments on this Earth as they work to protect us: our families, our friends, our children. Because that's what they do, they work to restore and maintain peace in our communities and neighborhoods.

When New York Police Officers Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu woke up on the morning of December 20th to put on their uniform, they had no idea it would be their last day. The two patrol officers were sitting in their squad car, working overtime, when a hateful and spiteful criminal struck. The ruthless murderer shot and killed the two officers in cold blood.

Officer Ramos and Officer Liu's lives were robbed from them.

Officer Liu was married only two months before, and now his wife is left as a widow. Officer Ramos was a devoted husband and father, active in his church with plans to join the ministry. These two men of solid character, were targeted and attacked. So much hate has been hurled at police officers.

Recently, two more New York Police Officers were shot while investigating a robbery call in the Bronx when they were shot and wounded by criminals. The disrespect of our law enforcement must stop. The soulless thugs who hunt down police officers and kill them have to be punished to the highest degree.

Underneath these uniforms are moms, dads, sisters, brothers, cousins and friends. Protecting us is their job. It is their duty to bring safety to our communities, to separate anarchy from order, and to bring justice to crime victims. No police officer should have to be any more fearful than they already are for their life while on patrol.

As Americans, we must let them know that we support them and are grateful for all they do for our communities. A nationwide campaign called Project Blue Light was launched to show support for the special men and women in our police force.

A single blue light in a window or front porch shows support for our peace officers. Neighborhoods, communities and towns should beam the glow of blue in support of these community warriors. Take the time to thank a police officer.

To many, the unknown is terrifying, but to police officers, it's just another day. Today, on National Law Enforcement Appreciation Day, we lift up all those who put their lives on the line every single day for us. They deserve the utmost respect and support not just today but every day of the year.

During my other life, I was a prosecutor and criminal court judge in Houston, Texas. I have known and still know individuals who wear the badge or the star over their heart. Some of those peace officers I knew gave their lives for the safety of others.

Peace officers put their lives between us and criminals. They stand between the law and the lawless. I have had the opportunity to know peace officers from all over the U.S.—including New York and especially New York City.

Years ago, I taught at the New York State Police Academy. After those folks from New York and I got through the language barrier, I found them to be some of New York's finest of people—some of the best peace officers in the country.

Peace officers are necessary in our society because some in our country refuse to follow the law. Ironically, we hire these men and women to do society's dirty work then society criticizes them for their actions.

Peace officers are the last strand of wire in the fence between the fox and the chickens. They have earned and deserve our respect. America should mourn the ambush and assassination of all those in law enforcement who have given their lives for order in America—especially the men in blue of New York.

And that's just the way it is.

SAVE AMERICAN WORKERS ACT
OF 2015

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 8, 2015

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 30, the so-called "Save American Workers Act of 2015." Republicans claim this bill is a fix to the Affordable Care Act and vital to protecting American jobs. But that's simply not true. According to the non-partisan CBO, raising the threshold for employers to provide coverage from 30 hours per week to 40 could lead them to shift more employees to part-time work, end employer-sponsored coverage for one million people, and leave up to half a million completely uninsured. Even conservative analyst Tuval Levin agreed, writing recently in the National Review, "Putting the cutoff for the employer mandate at 40 hours would put far, far more people at risk of having their hours cut than leaving it at 30 hours." On top of the assaults on workers' hours and benefits, CBO estimates the bill would increase the federal deficit by \$53 billion over the next decade."

Republicans have brought this irresponsible bill to the floor on the heels of more news that the Affordable Care Act is working. Yesterday, Gallup released data showing the percentage of uninsured Americans is declining steeply and HHS announced that nearly 6.6 million Americans selected plans or were re-enrolled in the federal exchange since open enrollment began.

As I have said before, I am more than willing to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make genuine, reasonable improvements to the Affordable Care Act. Along these lines, I want to commend Congressman JOE COURTNEY for bringing an alternative proposal to the Rules Committee yesterday. Unfortunately, today's bill does not meet the definition of a genuine, reasonable improvement.

Finally Mr. Speaker, if Republicans were really serious about helping employees they would support the CEO/Employee Paycheck Fairness Act. The bill is simple. It says if corporations want to be able to deduct the bonuses and compensation for their CEOs and other executives over \$1 million, they better be giving their employees a fair shake. I urge my colleagues to reject the 40-hour bill and join me in a real effort to support American workers.

H.R. 37—PROMOTING JOB CREATION AND REDUCING SMALL BUSINESS BURDENS ACT

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 2015 I inadvertently voted yes on Roll Call number 9, on H.R. 37—the so-called "Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act". I intended to vote no on this bill and I wish to make my position clear for the record.

I oppose this bill because it undermines the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act. This im-

portant law was passed in response to the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression and it was designed to ensure that Wall Street will never again be able to destroy our economy. The crisis was made worse by the widespread trading of complex financial derivatives, many of which were not understood by those engaged in their trade, and many of which were not used by "end users" engaged in traditional hedging of risk. Dodd-Frank protects our economic security by requiring over-the-counter derivatives to be regulated by both the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) and the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). This bill would undermine those protections by forbidding regulators from imposing requirements that margin or collateral be provided for derivatives transactions involving commercial companies. The legislation is also harmful in that it entirely eliminates statutory authority for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) and the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) to regulate margin and collateral at non-bank derivatives dealers serving commercial end users.

Even though regulators have not proposed to require any margin of commercial end users at this time, it is inappropriate to completely eliminate the ability of central derivatives market regulators to take action in this important area. This is a clear attempt by Republicans to delay and weaken implementation of core parts of the Dodd-Frank Act at the expense of main street, and our future economic security.

Unfortunately, this misguided bill was brought to the floor with complete disregard for proper legislative process. Legislation such as this should be considered by committees and members should have the opportunity to offer amendments. This did not occur in this instance and instead was brought directly to the floor on a suspension of the normal House rules that apply.

Although I inadvertently voted "yes" on this bill, I am encouraged that H.R. 37 did not pass the house and I stand in solidarity with my colleagues who voted no.

RECOGNIZING PAULA SAMPSON ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT FROM FAIRFAX COUNTY

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and commend Paula C. Sampson on the occasion of her retirement after a long and distinguished career in public service to the residents of Fairfax County, Virginia. For the past 15 years, Paula has been the director of the Department of Housing and Community Development. She has spent her career focused on putting home ownership within reach of more people and finding more affordable options for those not yet able to purchase their own home.

After graduating from the University of Michigan with degrees in political science and history, Paula landed a job as a local urban planner. She then relocated to the National Capital Region and accepted a position with the National Association of Counties in its Legislative Affairs Office.

Fairfax County recruited her to become the Housing Department's Director of Real Estate

Finance in 1986. In 1994, Paula left Fairfax to become CEO of the Connecticut Housing Investment Fund, a state-wide, nonprofit organization focused on affordable housing. Thankfully Paula realized her true home was here in Fairfax, returning in 1999.

I served on the Board of Supervisors at the time and knew she would be a real champion for housing, which is no small feat. On the administrative side, you're managing public dollars, gauging the local housing market, and building community partnerships with banks and nonprofits. But there is also a human side, in which you're working to assist residents across the spectrum, from those seeking help buying a first home to those wanting assistance managing their money so they can one day afford a home to those who are homeless and simply need a warm place to rest their heads.

Paula truly gets it and proved adept and skillful in juggling those different aspects of her duties. In describing herself, she says, "While the complexities of real estate finance, the challenges of deal-making and the excitement of the ribbon-cutting are all fun, the real motivator for me is helping an individual have a place to call home. My own modest beginning showed me that growing up in a stable home is the stepping stone to future success."

I had the pleasure of working closely with Paula during my tenure as Chairman of the Board of Supervisors on a successful affordable housing preservation initiative. We had identified the growing shortage of affordable housing as a primary challenge for the County. Job growth was significantly outpacing construction of new housing units, and those that had once been affordable were quickly being converted or redeveloped into condominium units to capitalize on the hot real estate market at the time.

We convened a summit of business, faith, nonprofit, and community leaders, and from that exercise we appointed a task force, which recommended the Board of Supervisors establish a goal of preserving 1,000 affordable housing units over a four year period, which at the time we viewed as a stretch goal. As Chairman, I was pleased to champion that goal and set that course for our community, but it was Paula who seized the mission and kept the Department's staff focused on advancing this cause at every turn and through every hurdle. Thanks to her efforts, and those of our many partners, we not only surpassed our goal, we nearly tripled it with 2,700 homes preserved. We were so successful that at one point, the Board dedicated the value of one penny on the local real estate tax to the preservation effort.

Based on the success of that initiative, we launched a campaign to prevent and end homelessness in 10 years, again hosting a summit and appointing a task force to build community support. It is because of that effort that Fairfax was able to break the mold and actually reduce its homeless population during the Great Recession while other communities struggled. Through it all, Fairfax has been blessed to have the strong support of the faith, nonprofit, and business communities, including Catholics for Housing, Homestretch, Cornerstones, Pathway Homes, United Community Ministries, Sekas Homes, Deloitte, the Fairfax County Chamber, and so many other community partners. We also worked together in advancing the concept of Magnet Housing in the

County to provide workforce housing for nurses, police officers, firefighters and other young professionals serving the community.

More recently, I was pleased to collaborate with Paula in support of the County's application to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for acceptance as a Move to Work agency. That designation provides invaluable flexibility with federal dollars to allow Fairfax to better leverage its housing and human service funds with assistance from community partners to provide homeless residents with housing and job training so they can "move to work" and self-sufficiency.

In addition to her regular duties, Paula also has served on multiple regional, state, and national boards, including the National Association of Local Housing Finance Agencies, the National Community Development Association, and the Freddie Mac Affordable Housing Advisory Committee.

Without question, she has helped make our community stronger, and helped provide other communities with the tools to model our success in Fairfax. Thanks to Paula's leadership Fairfax is moving ever close to goal of providing safe, affordable housing for all those who wish to call our community home.

Mr. Speaker, Paula Sampson's commitment to public service has set an example that will benefit our community for generations to come. Her accomplishments are truly outstanding and deserving of our sincere appreciation. When I was Chairman of the County Board, we often joked when retirement announcements like this came before the Board that we should pass a resolution to not allow such talented and dedicated staff to leave public service, and I certainly wish that was the case here.

I wish Paula the best of luck in her retirement, and I ask my colleagues in the House to join me in expressing our appreciation for her long and fruitful service to the residents of Fairfax County.

FRACKING IS JEOPARDIZING THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE U.S. ECONOMY

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my growing concern about the economic issues of fracking. The once booming oil fracking market could be headed for a bust.

If a bust in the oil fracking sector does happen, it could create massive losses on Wall Street and for investors on Main Street in two ways. First, fracking oil drillers issued massive amounts of debt to construct the necessary wells. With the price of gas falling, many oil fracking drillers now face cash shortfalls. As a result, it is becoming more and more difficult for frackers to meet their debt servicing obligations. If the debt servicing obligations are not met, investors on Main Street and Wall Street could be left holding billions of dollars of worthless bonds.

Second, many companies took out derivatives contracts against market fluctuation, insuring stable cash flow. Losses are mounting on these contracts as oil prices fall. Wall Street banks that own many of these contracts

will have to absorb massive losses. The unexpected shock of falling oil prices may destabilize the balance sheet of these big banks, creating the conditions for another financial crisis.

Below is an article from Truthout.org that further explains this issue.

[Truthout.org]

RUSSIA BLAMED, U.S. TAXPAYERS ON THE HOOK, AS FRACKING BOOM COLLAPSES

(By Ben Ptashnik)

As Congress removes restrictions on taxpayers bailing out the too-big-to-fail banks, the right is blaming environmentalists and Russia for the demise of the fracking boom. In reality, the banks' junk bonds and derivatives have flooded Wall Street, and now the fracking bubble threatens another financial crisis.

Collapsing crude oil prices due to oversupply are reaching tsunami proportions, threatening Wall Street banks, investors and a dozen countries, foremost Russia, Iran and Venezuela, where revenue losses have caused severe financial degradation, and economies are about to implode. While Americans are today enjoying \$2 per gallon gasoline, Wall Street's analysts predict that an imminent energy market collapse will bring financial institutions to their knees once again, and taxpayers are being set up for another mandatory bailout.

At the heart of these tectonic shifts in the entire energy sector is the recent expansion of the hydraulic fracturing (fracking) industry, a boom cycle that began in earnest when Congress and the Bush administration passed the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which exempted the new horizontal drilling technology from the Clean Water Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act and the National Environmental Policy Act. By tapping considerable quantities of new oil and gas resources from shale deposits, the fracking boom promised U.S. energy independence, upending the world's prevailing paradigms around renewable energy and peak oil expectations. Environmentalists fought against the huge Keystone pipeline infrastructure that would deliver the fossil fuels to foreign markets, fearing that exploiting these resources would undermine the struggle for the curbing of carbon emissions.

Fracking also threatened the dominance of Russia and Saudi Arabia as the fossil fuel suppliers of Europe when it became evident that the United States would soon become a net exporter. In the United States, fracking was hyped on Wall Street as a get-rich-quick opportunity, attracting massive capital input, and creating an investment bubble. Bloomberg reported this year that the number of bonds issued by oil and gas companies has grown by a factor of nine since 2004.

"There's a lot of Kool-Aid that's being drunk now by investors," Tim Gramatovich, chief investment officer and founder of Peritus Asset Management LLC, told Bloomberg in an April 2014 article. "People lose their discipline. They stop doing the math. They stop doing the accounting," he continued. "They're just dreaming the dream, and that's what's happening with the shale boom."

When gas fracking first popped onto the scene, grandiose claims were made that the United States had 100 years of gas supply in shale, or 2,560 trillion cubic feet. And Wall Street rode that initial estimate. The only downside (beside the environmental disaster left by this toxic industry) was that, like the housing bubble which depended on ever-growing home values to maintain profitability, shale gas wells had to deliver consistent or growing production and profitability to pay back heavy debt interest loans

on well driller companies: \$3 to \$9 million per well. Fracking wells require not just drilling, but also huge injections of energy, water, sand and chemicals to fracture the rocks that hold the oil and gas deposits.

But in fact, no statistical evidence confirmed the hyped claims of a 100-year shale gas supply. In 2011, a study downsized this estimate from 2,560 trillion cubic feet to 750 trillion cubic feet, and by 2013, the U.S. Geological Survey refined that down to 481 trillion cubic feet—less than a 19-year supply based on 2013 rates of production. Nevertheless, huge amounts of capital poured into increasingly marginal operations, and the fracking market was flooded with junk bonds and derivatives as investors piled in.

Meanwhile oil fracking, which is separate from gas fracking, also needed huge injections of capital, but more importantly, oil frackers needed oil prices to stay at \$85 a barrel or higher on average to break even. Many of the shale oil wells that have sucked up a huge amount of investment have also turned out to have short lives and their operators required continued infusions of capital to drill new wells to keep afloat, even as prices tumbled due to the glut they themselves created. The Bakken, one of the largest oil fracking plays, is a typical example. It grew exponentially after environmental protections were removed. But since 2008, Bakken has required increasingly larger numbers of wells just to maintain level production and service debt. The industry, already in trouble in 2013, has now endured plunging revenues through a year of oil selling at \$60 to \$70 per barrel, on average, instead of \$90 to \$100.

Everyone had expected that in 2014 the Saudis would move to limit supply and maintain stable oil prices by cutting back production, as OPEC has done for decades. But an unexpected shockwave hit the industry in November 2014: The Saudis laid down the gauntlet and announced their intention to continue full production and let oil prices drop.

For the Saudis, this serves two purposes: First, it undermines the expansion of U.S. shale oil by forcing prices down so low that many of the wells have to be shut down or lose money. Second, it punishes their enemy, Iran, whose oil export-based economy has been savaged by the lower prices. The Saudis are sitting pat, with a trillion-dollar war chest savings account accumulated over a decade of \$100 per barrel oil. Oil Minister Ali al-Naimi has publicly admitted that the Saudis will wait as long as needed to retain market share, even if prices plunge further.

Falling oil prices will place a huge stress on the world's junk bond market as energy companies now account for 15 percent of the outstanding issuance in the non-investment grade bond market. The plunge in the prices of crude could trigger a "volatility shock large enough to trigger the next wave of defaults," according to Deutsche Bank.

This explains why the Obama administration—with complicity of both congressional Democrats and Republicans—managed in the wee hours of the morning to slip a loophole into the supposedly "must-pass" cliff-hanger omnibus budget bill. This toxic Trojan horse, passed in December 2014, now includes a minor footnote provision that might cause taxpayers to pick up the tab on more than a trillion dollars (yes, trillion) if the energy market bubble implodes, which it must if oil stays at half the price it fetched just six months ago.

After last minute, heavy lobbying on the budget bill by Jamie Dimon of JPMorgan Chase and an army of 3,000 Wall Street lobbyists, it appears that once again sufficient insecurity and fear had been spread among the political class regarding destabilization

of the financial markets (or withdrawal of campaign financing). They allowed a last minute amendment that killed Dodd-Frank protections, and allowed U.S. taxpayers to be shaken down to cover Wall Street's shale gambling debacle.

The heavy-handed move by the financial industry has outraged progressives and libertarians alike. It seems that these Wall Street criminals, like junkies attached to their drugs of choice, just could not resist the high of easy cash from Ponzi scheme market bubbles, and so they have stuck it to the U.S. public once again: Preposterously huge bonuses, Porsches, pricey call girls, and million-dollar Manhattan condos were at stake. So hey, why should they kick the habit? After all, not a single one of those con artists went to jail last time.

Wall Street is now flooded with fracking industry derivatives contracts that protect the profits of oil producers from dramatic swings in the marketplace. Derivatives are essentially insurance policies taken out by the oil industry to guard against fluctuations in the cost of fossil fuel supplies. Dramatic swings rarely happen, but when they do they can be absolutely crippling.

Derivatives taken out to ensure prices don't go down are now creating billions in losses for those who sold such bets on the market; someone is going to have to absorb massive losses created by the sudden drop in oil on the other end of those insurance contracts. In many cases, it is the big Wall Street banks, and if the price of oil does not rebound substantially they could be facing colossal losses.

The big Wall Street banks did not expect plunging home prices to implode the mortgage-backed securities market in 2008, but their current models also did not have \$60 oil prices included in projections. The huge losses may send a shock wave into the entire financial industry. It has been estimated that the six largest "too-big-to-fail" banks control \$3.9 trillion in commodity derivatives contracts, those same gambling instruments that brought us the 2008 housing collapse. And a very large chunk of that amount is made up of oil derivatives. Combined with the huge flood of shale junk bonds on the market, the derivatives could initiate a bubble burst that could turn into a financial market implosion.

Meanwhile, the global climate change issue and energy market turbulence have morphed into geopolitical tensions over European fracking. Unsubstantiated allegations in a New York Times report by Andrew Higgins claim that the Russians are funding anti-fracking protests to maintain their hegemony over gas markets.

The allegations have infuriated environmentalists and climate justice activists. The last thing they want is to be made scapegoats for the fracking collapse and be played as the neo-Cold War dupes of the Russian empire. But memories of red-baiting suddenly hang in the air as (by seemingly coincidence) dozens of right-wing media sites regularly devoted to anti-Soviet slanders or climate change denial immediately picked up Higgins' Times piece, as if on cue.

There are now dozens more of such published reports. Even as the U.S. fracking industry collapses and tensions over control of Ukraine and other former Soviet satellites re-emerge, there seems to be a concerted right-wing effort to label fracking opponents Russian agents.

Vague innuendos dominate this narrative. In the Times piece, for example, former NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen is quoted: "I have met allies who can report that Russia, as part of their sophisticated information and disinformation operations, engage actively with so-called non-

government organizations." Others write, "Some in Sophia believe" or "Those who suspect Russian involvement" or "There's no smoking gun, yet . . ."

Critics in Romania accused the Times and Higgins of scapegoating environmentalists and acting as partisan players in a renewed Cold War.

"What, exactly, is the grand total of evidence that Russia is financing these anti-fracking protests?" asks American blogger in Romania, Sam C. Roman, in his article, "Pot vs. Kettle," pointing out that the first anti-Russia allegation came from a politician who owned land that Chevron planned to frack, and is thus losing money from the protests. "Not one allegation against Russia in the entire article is proven by a single document, piece of evidence or other direct proof. All that exists are shadowy insinuations and allegations." He asserts that accusations by Lithuanian, Romanian and NATO officials against Russia have not yet to be backed up by any proof.

"Add it up," Roman writes. "You've got two former NATO [secretary generals] stumping for Chevron (which competes with Gazprom, a Russian energy company that also conducts fracking operations in Europe) blaming the Russian government for protests. . . . And all of this tied up in a neat little bow by an American journalist who has already been caught publishing anti-Russian propaganda in his newspaper before."

This all leaves the United States somewhat schizophrenic. On the one hand, the United States and NATO's foreign policy hawks are delighted by the oil price collapse; it serves to isolate and subdue Russia, expand NATO's influence in Eastern Europe, and puts pressure on Iran to negotiate on nuclear aspirations. Not to mention that with gasoline at \$2 per gallon, consumer spending and economic growth will be enhanced. The U.S. economy grew by a comparatively robust 5 percent in the third quarter of 2014.

According to an article by Larry Elliott in *The Guardian*, "Stakes Are High as U.S. Plays the Oil Card Against Iran and Russia," the price drop was an act of geopolitical warfare by the United States, administered by the Saudis. Elliott suggests that U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry allegedly struck a deal with Saudi Arabia's King Abdullah in September. That might explain how oil prices dropped during the crisis caused by Islamic State in Iraq and Syria, which would normally have caused prices to rise.

It would also explain why the Obama administration allowed the financial industry the amendment to Dodd-Frank that effectively exempts financial institutions from liability associated with derivatives. Though shale derivatives were not specifically mentioned by the Wall Street lobbyists as they pressured their allies in Congress and the White House, it is becoming increasingly clear that the too-big-to-fail banks were beginning to panic as dark clouds gathered on the horizon in the shale derivatives trade.

Most bank customers and voters don't know that Congress has already written into finance regulations that, in the case of insolvency, financial institutions could grab the assets of depositors and "bail-in"—which means they can save themselves from their losses in gambling operations at their investment divisions by grabbing cash assets of depositors, even those that are FDIC guaranteed, and legally convert them to bank stocks. That means that in the event of another market crash, Chase and Citi could take their depositors' cash in savings accounts or CDs, and give the customers back a bank stock certificate (of questionable value) instead.

There are also those who scratch their heads and ask, "Why did the TBTF banks

push for a deletion of the Dodd-Frank provision now, instead of waiting for the friendlier Republican-controlled Congress to pass this legislation?" The only answer that seems to make sense, and explain their urgency, is that the collapse is imminent.

In the 1990s dot-com craze, every new Silicon Valley start-up company was advertised as the next Microsoft. What followed was the crash of 2000, when the NASDAQ dropped 4,000 points (80 percent) in months. This chart below is what the crash looked like in 2000 to 2002 after the market had reached 5,000 (almost exactly where it stands today).

Having learned their lesson well from the last bailout, and knowing that they will have a much harder time coming to Congress hat-in-hand after a collapse, the TBTF banks probably decided not to wait, pushing their minions in the Beltway to inoculate them as soon as possible from the potential market explosion. In the meantime, they were probably dumping their own stocks on unsuspecting investors. Based on year-end reports for March 31, 2014, for 127 major oil companies, cash input for the fracking industry was \$677 billion, while revenues from operations only totaled \$568 billion—a difference of almost \$110 billion. And this was before the price of oil started dropping six months ago.

In three out of seven major fracking fields in North America, companies are already reporting losses, with closures particularly acute in Canada. It's not clear whether economists fully appreciate what's about to transpire. This decline in rig count is just the beginning. Perhaps the end will come as early as this winter or spring, as fiscal reports for 2014's fourth quarter are published, operations shut down, crews are laid off, and many unprofitable oil and gas rigs are mothballed.

So, whom will the banks, brokers and investors scapegoat for this upcoming crash? Some predict that they will likely use every available media outlet to blame community activists, Democrats and Obama for stopping the Keystone pipeline and for opposing the fracking industry. And as in the climate change denial movement, the narrative will probably use "communist" and "socialist" rhetoric, which is why the Russian card is so important to play: Hence the Higgins article.

The pundits on Fox will likely play on the patriotism of the right and use their Big Lie ploy (say something enough times, it becomes the truth) to the hilt. Six months from now, while studiously avoiding mention of our "allies," the Saudis, or the Wall Street banks, they will likely be vociferously defending those poor "beleaguered U.S. oilmen" who could have made our country strong and independent again in energy, but were broken by the Democrats and those "commie environmentalists" working for Putin. The market crash will be blamed on the "climate hoax."

NORTH KOREA IS A STATE
SPONSOR OF TERROR

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the saga with North Korea and its band of tyrants has gone on far too long.

On November 24th, Sony Pictures Entertainment was attacked. No its headquarters were not bombed, nor did anyone storm the buildings. This was a cyber attack.

It is believed to be the worst of its type on a company on U.S. soil. Hackers released

personal data of Sony employees, disabled Sony's IT systems, and destroyed data.

Shortly after, anonymous emails threatened movie-goers hoping to see the Sony film, "The Interview". These threats warned about "9/11-style" terrorist attacks.

A little over a month later, on December 29, the FBI said North Korea was responsible for the cyber attack.

Contrary to what the President has called "cyber vandalism", this cyber terrorism deserves a bold, immediate response.

The world's dictators and terrorists must know without a doubt that an attack—cyber or physical—on the U.S. will result in a devastating response. This starts with the little dictator of Pyongyang, Kim Jong-Un.

It needs to immediately put North Korea back on the State Sponsors of Terrorism list. Representative ROS-LEHTINEN has a bill that puts tough sanctions on North Korea and urges the Administration to put North Korea back on the list. I am an original cosponsor of the bill.

There is no doubt that North Korea belongs on the State Sponsors of Terrorism list.

In July 2009, UAE officials discovered a North Korean ship full of weapons heading to Iran.

Iran has been on the state sponsor of terrorism list since 1984 because it provides hundreds of millions of dollars and tons of weapons to terrorist groups like Hezbollah and Hamas. So when one hears about North Korea sending weapons to Iran, it is not a typical transfer of weapons. This is about giving a recognized state sponsor of terrorism more guns to put in the hands of known and designated terrorist groups.

Five months after the UAE seizure, Thai authorities found 35 tons of North Korean weapons on a plane, also traveling to Iran and ultimately bound for delivery to foreign terrorist organizations Hezbollah and Hamas.

In April 2010, South Korean officials apprehended two North Korean military-trained agents who had orders to assassinate a defector from North Korea.

On March 26, 2010, North Korea sunk a South Korean naval vessel, killing 46 sailors.

On November 23, 2010 North Korea repeatedly bombed a small South Korean island, killing two civilians and two marines.

So far, as punishment for the cyber attack on Sony, the President sanctioned ten individuals and three organizations tied to North Korea's intelligence, arms supply, and defense research.

These sanctions are not enough. Other people or organizations not sanctioned by the U.S. can easily take over the same work.

Reinstating North Korea on the State Sponsors of Terrorism list would deepen existing sanctions and could deliver a crippling blow to the little dictator of Pyongyang.

This Administration cannot allow the United States to be bullied again and again.

The West allowed Putin into Ukraine. We have watched ISIS behead our journalists. We have seen Americans die in Israel at the hands of Hamas.

Now, we have let North Korea silence us.

To have a country on the other side of the world not just threaten but actually take away one of America's most fundamental rights is outrageous.

It is time to stop appeasing our enemies.

And that's just the way it is.

IN HONOR OF OUR BRAVE MEN
AND WOMEN ON LAW ENFORCE-
MENT APPRECIATION DAY

HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I believe in the rule of law. For that reason, today on the first annual Law Enforcement Appreciation Day (L.E.A.D.), I would like to honor our brave men and women in both state as well as federal law enforcement agencies. In our nation, we have approximately 900,000 law enforcement officials. Without these hard-working individuals, who constantly risk their lives, the rule of law would not be possible. According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), 76 law enforcement officers lost their lives in the line-of-duty in 2013, 27 deaths were the result of felonious, criminal acts by perpetrators. My own home state of Texas has lost more officers than any other state in the U.S.

Mr. Speaker, throughout my life I have been truly inspired by the professionalism and devotion to public safety of those in law enforcement. I know I speak for many people of good will when I say I wholeheartedly support the efforts of law enforcement officers to serve and protect our communities and our country. Additionally, we will not let the questionable actions of a few individuals acting under the color of law besmirch the reputation and legacy of all law enforcement officers in our great nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 2015, I missed recorded votes #1–7 as I was attending the funeral of Governor Mario Cuomo in New York.

I would like to reflect how I would have voted if I were here and sworn into office:

On Roll Call #1 I would have voted present (Quorum Call).

On Roll Call #2 I would have voted for NANCY PELOSI for Speaker.

On Roll Call #3 I would have voted no (Motion to Table).

On Roll Call #4 I would have voted no (Previous Question).

On Roll Call #5 I would have voted yes (Motion to Commit).

On Roll Call #6 I would have voted no (Passage of House Rules Package).

On Roll Call #7 I would have voted yes (Passage "Hire More Heroes Act of 2015" H.R. 22).

I would also like to reflect that I would have voted for the Honorable NANCY PELOSI for Democratic Leader.

RECOGNIZING U.S. AMBASSADOR
TO BANGLADESH DAN MOZENA

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, as he retires from the Foreign Service next week, I rise today to recognize the outstanding work of the U.S. Ambassador to Bangladesh Dan Mozena. He led a distinguished career of public service to the United States, capped by his impressive efforts over the past several years to promote workers' safety and advance fundamental labor rights in Bangladesh.

Following a string of tragedies in the Bangladesh garment industry, including the collapse of the Rana Plaza factory that took the lives of 1,138 workers in 2013 and the factory fire at Tazreen Fashions that took the lives of 112 workers in 2012, Ambassador Mozena has advocated for workers' safety and their right to freedom of association. He has urged Bangladesh to transform its garment sector from a model based on a race-to-the-bottom in labor standards, to one where a "Made in Bangladesh" becomes a label valued for the country's commitment to workers' rights and high standards for safety.

Following the U.S. Government's decision to suspend trade preferences and issue an Action Plan focused on labor rights and factory safety, Ambassador Mozena convened the embassies of other garment importing countries (Netherlands, Canada, the United Kingdom, and the European Union) with the responsible Bangladesh Government Secretariats on a monthly basis to track progress. This model for joint advocacy is one that merits recognition and replication as our Embassies work to elevate labor rights in developing economies.

Ambassador Mozena worked with the U.S. Department of Labor to bring the first Labor Attaché to Bangladesh, and he leaves an institutional framework to help advance labor rights in this young and developing country. Under Mozena's leadership the U.S. Embassy became a place where workers could turn to for help when they faced coercion, repression, and anti-union violence.

Of course, there is a tremendous amount of work that still needs to be accomplished in Bangladesh to ensure that workers are safe and that their fundamental rights are respected in the workplace. Ambassador Mozena has fought to ensure that momentum is going in the right direction in Bangladesh—we must continue this work moving forward.

Ambassador Mozena's accomplishments extend beyond labor rights. Since presenting his Letters of Credence to the President of Bangladesh on November 24, 2011, Ambassador Mozena has strengthened relations between the United States and Bangladesh by promoting a Bangladesh that is peaceful, secure, prosperous, healthy, and democratic. He emphasized understanding the diversity of Bangladesh, making visits to each of the country's 64 districts. In the United States, he has visited Bangladeshi-Americans across the country.

During his time as Ambassador, Mozena oversaw the largest aid budget in Asia outside of Afghanistan and Pakistan, bolstering Bangladeshi food security and nutrition, improving health, and increasing capacity to

cope with climate change, natural disasters, and security challenges.

Beyond Ambassador Mozena's current posting in Dhaka, he had an impressive career advancing U.S. interests in South Asia and Africa. He previously served in Bangladesh as Political/Economic Counselor from 1998–2001 and as a Deputy Political Counselor in India and Pakistan. A member of Senior Foreign Service, Mozena was U.S. Ambassador to Angola from 2007–2010 and previously worked in the Office of Southern African Affairs from 1993 to 1995, during South Africa's transition from apartheid to democracy. Previous postings include Lusaka and Kinshasa and a year as a professor at the National War College.

Ambassador Mozena's family has stood by his side as he has pursued his career overseas. His wife of 40 years, Grace, is a retired elementary school teacher who served with him as a Peace Corps volunteer in then-Zaire. Their two children, Anne and Mark, followed their father throughout the world. I understand that Mozena also looks forward to spending time with the newest addition to his family, a granddaughter named Mira, as well as his mother Edna.

As Ambassador Mozena returns to his family in the United States, we recognize his work in Bangladesh and throughout his career as a Foreign Service Officer.

THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION
TURNS 226

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week 226 years ago, the first presidential election in United States history was held across the 13 original colonies. Nowadays things change in the blink of an eye, so one can imagine how much our country has changed in 226 years.

Texas was still a part of the Spanish Empire in 1789 and the United States had just recently gained its independence from the British Empire. Back then, voting eligible citizens would walk or ride their horses down cobblestone roads to the nearest poll.

Oddly enough, the first voters voted by voice, rather than the secret ballot that we're all used to now. Voters wouldn't even vote for who they wanted as President, but would actually vote for their state's electors. The chosen electors would then cast their vote for President. Though we still have electors, citizens now vote for who they believe should be President rather than their state's electors. Electors are instead chosen by state governments and then each one is expected to vote with the will of the people of their state. The Electoral College voting system has been one of the lone constants in an ever-changing political and voting landscape. It was used in the first Presidential election and has been used in every election since.

While the Electoral College has remained in place since 1789, voting rights have changed significantly over the years. For the first Presidential election, an eligible voter was defined as any white, land-owning male. However, our country has progressed a great deal since then and now defines an eligible voter as any citizen over the age of 18, regardless of race, gender, or societal status.

We should be proud to live in a country whose government recognizes everyone as equal and allows each individual to vote, regardless of race or gender. From 13 colonies to 50 states and from voting by voice to voting on touch-screen computers, our elections have come a long way since 1789, and I expect the next 226 years to be just as great.

And that's just the way it is.

IN HONOR OF PETER CHACON

HON. JUAN VARGAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Peter Chacon for a lifetime of selfless service and leadership to our nation and our community. He served honorably in the United States Air Force during World War II and in the California State legislature for over 20 years.

Born in Phoenix, Arizona, Mr. Chacon was raised in a home of modest means with three older sisters and three younger brothers. As a teenager, he would shine shoes and park cars in downtown Phoenix to help support his family. His father, Petronilo Chacon, served as a commander in Mexico to Pancho Villa's revolutionary Army and taught Mr. Chacon to fight for what he believed in with passion and determination, while defending the rights of those who could not do the same.

In 1943, at the age of 18 and in the midst of World War II, Mr. Chacon enlisted in the U.S. Air Force. He served honorably for two years of wartime service as a Ball Turret Gunner on a B-17 Flying Fortress. During his service, he flew 35 successful missions over Germany. On one such mission, his plane was shot down and forced to crash land on a small island off the Italian coast where he and the rest of the crew were later rescued.

After the war, Mr. Chacon returned home as a hero and enrolled in San Diego City College and later San Diego State University where he received a bachelor's degree in education and a master's degree in school administration. He began a career as a teacher, where he discovered injustices facing Spanish speaking children in schools. In 1968, with the help of two friends, Mr. Chacon founded the Chicano Federation in an effort to unite the Latino voice in the San Diego community. One of the first accomplishments of the Chicano Federation was the creation of the historic Chicano Park in the Barrio Logan community. Chicano Park has come to be an important symbol of the Chicano Movement.

In 1969, Mr. Chacon decided to run for the California State Assembly in an effort to change the education system from within. Mr. Chacon was elected in 1970 to represent California's 79th assembly district, where he served for 22 years. He is best known for authoring legislation to create the California Housing Finance Agency, the Rural Housing Development Program, and the landmark Bilingual/Bicultural Education Program for the more than 230,000 limited English speaking students in the state.

Mr. Chacon was an inspirational leader in the San Diego community and his contributions will not be forgotten. He is survived by his four sons, Chris, Paul, Ralph and Jeff.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF KAREN WILKINSON

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today, as Ranking Member and former Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I join with my colleague, Rep. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT, the former Chairman and Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, in celebrating the life and recognizing the accomplishments of Karen Wilkinson, who sadly passed away on January 5.

Karen was a dedicated public servant, highly valued counsel to the Committee, and beloved colleague.

We were fortunate to get to know Karen through her work for the Committee in 2008 and 2009. During that time, Karen, an Assistant Federal Public Defender, was a detailee from the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. Her detail was the first of a Federal Public Defender to Congress. After her work with the Committee, she returned to Phoenix, Arizona to continue representing indigent clients in federal criminal cases, which she had done for eight years before coming to the Committee. Prior to that, she clerked for the U.S. District Court for Arizona and then joined the law firm of Brown & Bain. Karen graduated magna cum laude from Arizona State University Law School, received a Masters in Business Administration from Nova University and her Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Michigan.

Karen's accomplishments during her tenure with the Committee include a number of bills that dealt with issues that are very important to improving our country's criminal justice system. During the 111th Congress, she was responsible for guiding several legislative measures to approval on the floor of the House of Representatives, including: H.R. 448, the Elder Abuse Victims Act of 2009; H.R. 632, the National Silver Alert Act 2009; H.R. 748, CAMPUS Safety Act of 2009; H.R. 908, the Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program Reauthorization Act of 2009; H.R. 1333, amending chapter 40 of title 18 of the United States Code to exempt the transportation, shipment, receipt, or importation of explosive materials for delivery to a federally recognized Indian tribes; H.R. 1727, the Managing Arson Through Criminal History, MATCH, Act; H.R. 1933, a Child is Missing Alert and Recovery Center Act; S. 1289, the Foreign Evidence Request Efficiency Act of 2009, and H.R. 2661, the Court Security Enhancement Act of 2009.

In addition, she served as lead counsel on several other very important bills under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee in the 111th Congress, such as: H.R. 503, the Prevention of Equine Cruelty Act of 2009; H.R. 2289, the Juvenile Justice Accountability and Improvement Act of 2009; H.R. 2095, the Restitution for the Exonerated Act; H.R. 1149, the Child Protection Reauthorization Act of 2009 and H.R. 1422, the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Reauthorization Act of 2009. Karen also developed proposals subsequently introduced as the Literacy Education and Rehabilitation Act, a bill to require a criminal defense representative to be appointed to the

United States Sentencing Commission, the Firearm Recidivist Sentencing Act, and legislation to correct the computation of good time credit in the federal prison system. Her work in developing H.R. 3327, the Ramos-Compean Justice Act of 2009, has led to subsequent bipartisan, bicameral introduction of that bill, now known as the Justice Safety Valve Act. This bill has become one of the critical proposals under consideration as a growing consensus in the country is recognizing the need to reform our sentencing laws in order to achieve greater fairness, save unnecessary costs in the criminal justice system, and reduce recidivism. These bills to reform the criminal justice system, developed through her efforts, are a lasting legacy of her dedication to achieving fairness and justice for all.

Karen's dedication to these issues during her time working for the Committee was representative of the professionalism and commitment she showed as an Assistant Federal Public Defender in representing her clients and vindicating their rights to equal and fair treatment under the law.

Today, we remember and appreciate Karen Wilkinson's dedication to public service, her commitment to fairness, her wise counsel, and the friendships she developed with us and her Judiciary Committee colleagues. We will honor her by pledging to advance the causes that were her life's calling.

HONORING GENE BESS

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Gene Bess from Poplar Bluff, Missouri for his exceptional years of service to the community as a basketball coach and mentor.

Coach Gene Bess is considered one of the most winningest college basketball coaches recently gaining his 1,200th win. Coach Gene has been recognized as one of the best coaches in college basketball winning two national junior college championships.

Coach Bess has been named the NJCAA Coach of the Year twice and Regional Coach of the Year 18 times. He has led the Raiders of Three Rivers College to 17 tournament appearances and the program has kept a winning record consistently over .750.

Coach Bess's impressive winning record is only one of the reasons he is such a beloved and respected member of the community. Coach Bess not only strives to motivate his players to do their best on the court, but to keep a clear focus on their future. He has expressed the importance he places on seeing his players continuing their education at other institutions and finishing their degrees.

For his remarkable accomplishments as a college basketball coach and his dedication to serve our community, it is my pleasure to recognize the achievements of Coach Gene Bess before the House of Representatives.

RECOGNIZING J. JORGE VERDUZCO

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of J. Jorge Verduzco of Laredo, Texas.

Jorge Verduzco's extraordinary career has been characterized by global citizenship and community service. Before beginning his career, Mr. Verduzco earned a Bachelor's in International Relations from St. Mary's University, a Master's degree in Latin American Studies from Georgetown University, a second Master's from the American Graduate School on International Management, and he completed graduate programs in Bank Marketing and Commercial Lending.

Jorge Verduzco worked in the Latin American and Administrative Bureaus of the U.S. Department of State for several years prior to joining the International Bank of Commerce in Laredo in 1981. With IBC, Mr. Verduzco has served admirably for over two decades. In addition, his economic development efforts along the Texas-Mexico border have been outstanding, serving as Chairman of the Texas-Mexico Authority Advisory Board, a member of the Policy Board of the Texas Department of Commerce, a founding member of the Border Trade Alliance and the Association of South Texas Communities, a founding Board Member of the Alliance for I-69 Texas, and a Board Member of the Texas Association of Business and Chambers of Commerce. His service exemplifies a shining example of humility and dedication.

In addition to his exemplary career, Jorge Verduzco is a committed husband of forty five years, father, grandfather, and author of "International Relations, The Organization of American States."

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize J. Jorge Verduzco for his many accomplishments and great contributions to the Laredo area. I thank you for this time.

RECOGNIZING MR. RAYMOND BENCIVENGO

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, today we recognize a career of committed service to our nation and our communities by Raymond Bencivengo of Philadelphia.

Mr. Bencivengo's service began as a United States Marine serving in Vietnam and continued for 25 years after as a Philadelphia Police officer, both on the beat and administratively. Even after retiring from the police force in 1984, Mr. Bencivengo continued his commitment to law, order and protection by serving as a Pennsylvania State Parole Agent for 20 years.

In the summer of 2014, Mr. Bencivengo officially began his well-deserved retirement.

The quiet, selfless service of those like Mr. Bencivengo should never go forgotten or unthanked. So today, I congratulate Raymond

Bencivengo and wish him all the best in his retirement.

CELEBRATING THE DEDICATION OF THE TINNER HILL HISTORIC SITE

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 9, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 100th Anniversary of the founding of the Fairfax County Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and to congratulate the Tinner Hill Heritage Foundation on the long-awaited dedication of the Tinner Hill Historic Site.

On January 8, 1915, at the home of Joseph Tinner in Falls Church, nine community leaders formed the Colored Citizens Protective League (CCPL) in order to fight an ordinance in the then Town of Falls Church that would have legalized forced segregation in the town. This pioneering group evolved to become the Fairfax County Branch of the NAACP, which has played an instrumental role in the struggle for civil rights in Fairfax County and the nation for the past 100 years and will continue to do so in its next century.

The Tinner Hill Foundation is a 501c(3) non-profit founded by Edwin B. Henderson II, a descendant of E.B. Henderson, the CCPL's first Secretary, to preserve this important piece of our community's history. The Foundation helps prepare tomorrow's leaders by ensuring they understand our community's past through cultural enrichment, arts, career and entrepreneurial education, mentoring, and counseling opportunities and by sponsoring clubs, groups, and organizations. The Foundation also has been engaged in the creation of The Tinner Hill Historic Site, The African American Heritage Walking Tour, The "Dear Editor" Contest, and The Tinner Hill Blues Festival.

I am proud to have partnered with the Foundation since I was the Providence District Supervisor on the Fairfax County Board. It was at a Foundation event like this where we first discussed the idea of preserving this property, and the very next day I worked with my colleagues on the Fairfax Board to direct the County Executive to collaborate with the City of Falls Church to purchase this site, which is so significant to the cultural history of our community. And earlier this year, I was pleased to help capture moving and inspirational stories from some of the Foundation's members as part of the Northern Virginia Civil Rights Archive, which my office assembled in collaboration with the Library of Congress and local library branches.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating the Tinner Hill Heritage Foundation on this momentous occasion and commending its members for their steadfast efforts to preserve and promote the legacy of the brave African Americans who established the Fairfax County Branch of the NAACP and for their commitment to advance educational opportunities for students in the community. I also congratulate the Fairfax County Branch of the NAACP on the occasion of its 100th anniversary. Please accept my sincere appreciation for your tireless efforts in support of equal rights and justice for all.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S121–S131

Measures Introduced: Two bills were introduced, as follows: S. 143–144. **Page S131**

Measures Considered:

Keystone XL Pipeline—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. **Pages S121–28**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 2 p.m., on Monday, January 12, 2015, Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, with the time until 5:30 p.m. equally divided and controlled in the usual form. **Page S131**

Messages from the House: **Pages S128–29**

Executive Communications: **Pages S129–31**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S131**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Additional Statements: **Page S128**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S131**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 12:08 p.m., until 2 p.m. on Monday, January 12, 2015. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S131.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 35 public bills, H.R. 235–269; and 7 resolutions, H.J. Res. 11–14; H. Con. Res. 6; and H. Res. 24–25 were introduced. **Pages H187–89**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H190**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Reverend Patrick Riffle, St. Peter’s Catholic Church, Washington, DC. **Page H159**

Reading of the Constitution: Pursuant to section 5 of H. Res. 5, the Chair recognized Representative Goodlatte for the reading of the Constitution. **Pages H161–68**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:28 a.m. and reconvened at 11:04 a.m. **Page H168**

Keystone XL Pipeline Act: The House passed H.R. 3, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, by a

yea-and-nay vote of 266 yeas to 153 nays with one answering “present”, Roll No. 16. **Pages H168–81**

Rejected the Garamendi motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 180 yeas to 237 nays, of Roll No. 15. **Pages H179–81**

H. Res. 19, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 3) and (H.R. 30), was agreed to on January 8.

Moment of silence: The House observed a moment of silence in memory of the victims of the terrorist attacks in France. **Page H181**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Monday, January 12th for Morning Hour debate. **Page H183**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today and appears on page H168.

Senate Referral: S. Con. Res. 2 was held at the desk.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H180–81, H181. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 2:02 p.m.

Committee Meetings

No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 2015

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 185, the “Regulatory Accountability Act of 2015”; and H.R. 37, the “Promoting Job Creation and Reducing Small Business Burdens Act”, 5 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of January 12 through January 16, 2015

Senate Chamber

On *Monday*, at approximately 2 p.m., Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to

consideration of S. 1, Keystone XL Pipeline, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill at 5:30 p.m.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Armed Services: January 13, to hold hearings to examine global challenges and United States national security strategy, 2:30 p.m., SD-G50.

Committee on Foreign Relations: January 13, to hold hearings to examine articulating the case for American leadership in the world, focusing on the national interest, 10 a.m., SD-419.

Select Committee on Intelligence: January 13, to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH-219.

House Committees

Committee on Armed Services, January 13, Full Committee, organizational meeting for the 114th Congress, 11 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, January 13, Full Committee, organizational meeting for the 114th Congress, 1 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, January 13, Full Committee, organizational meeting for the 114th Congress, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, January 13, Full Committee, organizational meeting for the 114th Congress, 10:30 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, January 13, Full Committee, organizational meeting for the 114th Congress; hearing entitled “Moving America Forward: With a Focus on Economic Growth”, 10 a.m., HVC-210.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, January 12

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 p.m., Monday, January 12

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1, Keystone XL Pipeline, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill at 5:30 p.m.

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E41, E46
 Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E45
 Costello, Ryan A., Pa., E40
 Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E46
 Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E39

Farr, Sam, Calif., E39
 Fitzpatrick, Michael G., Pa., E46
 Green, Al, Tex., E44
 Honda, Michael M., Calif., E39
 Johnson, Henry C. "Hank", Jr., Ga., E41
 Levin, Sander M., Mich., E44
 Lowey, Nita M., N.Y., E40

McDermott, Jim, Wash., E42
 Meeks, Gregory W., N.Y., E44
 Poe, Ted, Tex., E40, E43, E45
 Smith, Jason, Mo., E46
 Van Hollen, Chris, Md., E41
 Vargas, Juan, Calif., E45



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.fdsys.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.